

K125-54  
J179(G)  
:3(b.S.:1)

DIE FRAGMENTE  
DER  
GRIECHISCHEN HISTORIKER

(F GR HIST)

VON

FELIX JACOBY

DRITTER TEIL  
GESCHICHTE VON STAEDTEN UND VOELKERN  
(HOROGRAPHIE UND ETHNOGRAPHIE)

b (Supplement)

A COMMENTARY ON THE ANCIENT HISTORIANS OF ATHENS

(Nos. 323a - 324)



PHOTOMECHANISCHER NACHDRUCK



希腊历史学家残篇

第3部分b(补遗)

卷1

正文

古代史 古代希腊

LEIDEN

E. J. BRILL

1954

00723

*Copyright 1954 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands*  
*All rights reserved, including the right to translate or to reproduce*  
*this book or parts thereof in any form.*

1. Auflage 1954

Photomechanischer Nachdruck  
der Erstauflage 1968

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

If there is an excuse for the bulk of this book it lies in its history. The importance of the writers on the History of Athens is such that they seem to ask for a very full treatment of the many problems raised by the single and often rather badly preserved remains of their great works. They have been curiously neglected since the first editions by Lenz-Siebelis (*Philochori Atheniensis Librorum Fragmenta*, Lipsiae 1811; *Phanodemi, Demonis, Clitodemi atque Istri Ἀρχιδων et reliquorum librorum fragmenta*, 1812) and the abbreviated reprint of the texts by C. Mueller in the first volume of his *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* (Parisiis 1841; with some Addenda in the fourth volume 1851), which forms easily the worst part of his otherwise admirable and most useful collection. My plan to fill the gap by an independent Commentary in three volumes, which because of its length was to stand outside the frame of the *Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*, became impossible under the conditions of the war and the post-war years. I therefore published the introduction as a special book (*Atthis, the Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens*, Oxford, At the Clarendon Press, 1949) and shelved the more essential commentary without much hope of being able to include it as a supplementary volume in the general edition of the *Fragmente*. For I well knew that it is impossible to-day to print a lengthy book of pure scholarship (with no special popular appeal) without the help of a public or private body, which knows that pure scholarship is the precondition for the survival of the Humanities. But this help soon came forth, rather unexpectedly and with an almost unexampled generosity, from the Bollingen Foundation (New York), and I will first record my deep and sincere gratitude to the Trustees of the Foundation and, in particular, to their Vice-President Mr. John D. Barrett, who have also taken under their wing the commentary on the other local historians (III b nos. 297-322; 335-607), the manuscript of which is in the hands of the publisher and the printing of which will begin in the course of 1954. It seems proper to acknowledge at once and again the never failing, equally generous, help given me through all the years of my residence in this country by Oxford University and the Dean and Governing Body of Christ Church, who made it possible for me to go on with a work which by necessity has become more and more the work of my life and which (I am glad to know) will be in good hands after my death.

For external help I am (as always) firstly indebted to my wife, who translated parts of my manuscript, typed the whole of it, and read most of the proofs, and secondly to the admirable staff (more especially the readers) of the printer's.

The commentary has been written in the years 1940-1945, and the manuscript has been in the keeping of the publisher since 1947. I have abbreviated it where I found it possible, but have not changed the text very much, and, especially, I have not tried to bring it up to date; even at the moment I feel uncertain whether or no to add at least a few Addenda—references to new books or papers on subjects treated in this commentary, for there is no room for resuming discussions at least on some outstanding questions, as for example the history of ostracism, the citizenship-law of Perikles, the Pelasgian problem and similar ones. It is not that I am pigheaded or that I feel an exaggerated confidence in the results which (with more or less certainty) I believe myself to have achieved. But since I arrived at some results (mostly, I hope, expressed with due caution, and more for the history of the tradition than for the facts themselves), and as no new material has become available (such as for example the Didymos papyrus gave us), it seems rather useless simply to repeat my opinions or enter into new controversies. Somewhere and somehow, after having worked long at the same texts and the same questions, one feels, so to speak, dried up, and wishes that others should deal with the opinions expressed, if they think it worth while. But in a spirit of making amends for what many may regard as a rather serious gap, I have added a copious and detailed index at the wish of the publisher and the advice of my friend Herbert Bloch.

A last and somewhat sore point (which, nevertheless, may perhaps incidentally serve as 'first aid to critics'): the English idiom is not at all what I should like it to be. I might excuse myself simply by quoting the *dictum* of a wise writer that 'no man fully capable of his own language ever masters another', did I not feel this facile (and perhaps even vain) excuse as an injustice to the cherished memory of the late Miss Margaret Alford, M.A. (Oxon.). She went with the utmost care through the whole manuscript as it was then. Therefore let me put the sorry fact thus: the blame for whatever offends an English ear may be put at my door.

Oxford, 25 December 1953.

F. JACOBY

### 323a. HELLANIKOS OF LESBOS

I discussed this distinguished figure in detail *RE* VIII, 1913, col. 104 ff. <sup>1)</sup>, and I edited the entire legacy of H. with a succinct commentary in *F Gr Hist* I, 1923, no. 4. In this book I shall edit the fragments 5 expressly quoted from the *Atthis*, and I shall add those to be assigned to the *Atthis* with greater or lesser probability, and those of which the contents must have occurred in the *Atthis*. The sum of fragments has been little increased by papyri, the information about the life and the work of the author has not been increased at all; my conception of 10 H., which has been approved of in general <sup>2)</sup>, has altered in details only: I shall therefore not repeat what I said in *RE* but confine myself to drawing more accurately certain fundamental lines of the literary work of the historian taken as a whole in the framework of the development of Greek Historiography <sup>3)</sup>.

15 Together with Hekataios of Miletos and Pherekydes of Athens <sup>4)</sup> Hellanikos forms the group of the three earliest historians of whom a considerable number of fragments have come down to us because they were read and used during all antiquity. The group represents the first stage of Greek historiography, and their writing time coincides almost 20 exactly with the fifth century. It begins with the two works of the Milesian, *viz.* (1) the four books mostly quoted as *Γενεαλογίαι* or *Ἡρωολογία*, sometimes simply as *Ἱστορίαι* <sup>5)</sup>, according to their contents, because the 'history of the heroic age' is told in them; (2) the two books of the *Περίοδος Γῆς* describing the known (and the unknown) world. 25 The two works inaugurated the two species called by us (as by the ancients) Mythography and Geography <sup>6)</sup>. Out of the *Περίοδος* there soon evolved the treatment of particular peoples (barbarians first) which for practical reasons we call Ethnography as a literary species <sup>7)</sup>; for ancient terminology distinguished between *ἔθνη* and *πόλεις* and 30 developed the particular form of town-chronicle for the latter. It is the species we call Horography because the earliest Ionian books of this kind (not those of the mother country) are cited as *᾽Ωροί*. All three species, which became secondary species after Herodotos' *Ἱστορίας ἀπόδεξις* was published, have their origin in the fifth century, and Hel- 35 lanikos cultivated all of them in an abundance of special works <sup>8)</sup>.

The first group, which in some respects is the most important, consists of five mythographical works: Φορωνίς, Δευκαλιωνεία, Ἀτλαντίς, Ἀσωπίς, Τρωικά<sup>9</sup>). In a sense they were final in regard to Mythography: for later authors from the fourth century onwards, and even for as early as a writer as Thukydides, they are the great authority for the heroic age<sup>10</sup>), the inferior limit of which is the Dorian (or for Athens the Ionian) migration. The group practically extends beyond the actual end of the first great Panhellenic war against Troy. The second group, the Ethnographies, is very voluminous, but perhaps less important because in this sphere development soon advanced beyond Hellenikos. It contains four or five works about barbarian countries—Egypt, Cyprus, Lydia [?], Scythia and (in two volumes) Persia<sup>11</sup>)—and as many about Greek districts—Αἰολικά and/or Λεσβιακά<sup>12</sup>), Θεσσαλικά, Βοιωτικά, Περὶ Ἀρχαδίας<sup>13</sup>). To Horography we can assign with certainty only the *Atthis* in two volumes<sup>14</sup>). The Ἰέρειαι (and the Καρνεονῆκαι) form a group by themselves<sup>15</sup>).

The end of this first stage chronologically overlaps the opening of the second, Greek Historiography in the narrower and proper sense. At its head stands the *ἱστορίας ἀπόδεξις* of Herodotos, which contains the roots of the three main forms of history: *viz.* Universal History (Κοινὰ ἱστορία, Πράξεις Ἑλλήνων καὶ βαρβάρων), Greek History (Ἑλληνικά), and monographs on wars<sup>16</sup>). The work, complete in the main, appeared after the death of the author between 430 and 424 B. C<sup>17</sup>), probably not a decade earlier than another work of Hellenikos, which also inaugurated a new species, namely the Universal Chronicle of the Ἰέρειαι τῆς Ἡρας αἱ ἐν Ἀργεῖ<sup>18</sup>). The Thucydidean torso, the first monograph of a war, was published a few years after H.'s *Atthis*, which was perhaps the last (or the last important) work of that author<sup>19</sup>).

The ancient tradition about the personal life of H. is scanty. It is practically confined to the facts of his birth in Mytilene<sup>20</sup>) and his death (in the 85th year of his life) in a continental place near his native island<sup>21</sup>). If the latter piece of information, which cannot be very well invented, derives from a contemporary source it does not seem quite impossible that the voluminous author roused the interest of wider circles<sup>22</sup>), as did contemporary sophistry, with which his literary output has some affinity. But this inference is less certain than that drawn from the discrepancies about the name of his father: H. did not call himself Ἑλλάνικος ὁ τοῦ δεῖνα but, in the fashion followed by Herodotos and Thukydides, merely Ἑλλάνικος Λέσβιος (or Μιτυληναῖος)<sup>23</sup>). That

means: he did not write any of his numerous books for the narrow circle of his countrymen as did the earlier Ionian horographers, not even the *Αιολικά* and the *Λεσβιακά*, for they were not local chronicles of his native town but 'ethnographical' books. He wrote, like Herodotos, Thukydidēs and the sophists, for all Greece in so far as it was literate. The scantiness of tradition concerning even a distinguished author of the fifth century is by no means surprising, and it is hardly necessary to give an express warning against inferring negligible importance from the want of information about a man's life. The case is different from that of poets, for a larger public is interested in them <sup>24</sup>), and there are documentary data about their appearance at Panhellenic and local festivals. There is no documentary tradition for prose-writers <sup>25</sup>). We have a few casual statements (which may be right or wrong) e.g. that a man had some connexion with Thurioi; a few inferences from Comedy showing an author's sojourn in Athens <sup>26</sup>); and that is almost all. It is typical that Apollodoros connected the *floruit* of Hellanikos with an epochal year of Tragedy, 465/4 B.C., and that the *Suda* made him live *κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους Εὐριπίδου καὶ Σοφοκλέους* <sup>27</sup>). But we trace the influence of Hellenistic biography, which groups together authors of the same category, in the statements of the same *Vita* that he was the successor of Hekataios <sup>28</sup>) and that he met Herodotos at the Macedonian court, which implies that Herodotos and he were contemporaries. Neither statement assists us in obtaining accurate dates <sup>29</sup>). Pamphila, a well-known writer of the time of Nero, tried to calculate on the basis of Apollodoros' dates the ages of the three great historians at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War (it is worth noticing that even then Hellanikos is considered quite on the same level as Herodotos and Thukydidēs). She correctly concluded from the dates that they were approximately contemporaries. If one examines the exact dates she gives one finds at once that they were reached by calculations; and if one investigates the foundations of these calculations one again finds at once that not one of them is documentary. The *floruit* of H. is flatly contradicted by the fact that the *Atthis* was published later than 407/6 B.C. <sup>30</sup>); it may be a great deal too early. How Apollodoros obtained his date is shown by the grouping of the earlier historians in Dionysios of Halikarnassos, in whose opinion Hellanikos was the predecessor of Herodotos <sup>30a</sup>); it is due to the general impression which his literary activity makes when taken as a whole. The determination by the chronographer was preceded by the history of the development of Greek prose, and it has proved fatal

for the chronological utilization of that sketch (by Theophrastos?) that it seems to have taken the style as the sole criterion for the arrangement of the fifth century authors. It must not be considered impossible that even an experienced chronologist like Apollodoros when using that sketch left out of account dates which could have been obtained from works themselves<sup>31</sup>), or in the best possible case when he spoke cautiously according to his custom that he left several possibilities open<sup>32</sup>). As things are we must resign ourselves to the fact that Apollodoros' date is certainly wrong and that we do not know the date of the birth,<sup>10</sup> or the death, or the literary activity of H. with any certainty<sup>33</sup>). In view of this uncertainty (which, as mentioned above, is in no way surprising) it may be justifiable at least to mention a suggestion which draws upon the name for a closer determination: 'Ελλάνικος is formed by haplology from 'Ελλανόνικος<sup>34</sup>), and it is attractive (though far<sup>15</sup> from certain<sup>35</sup>) to connect it, if not with the naval victory at Salamis, as the Euripides *Vita* does<sup>36</sup>), with that of Mykale (August 479 B.C.<sup>37</sup>), the outcome of which was the deliverance of the Greeks in Asia Minor and their accession to the Hellenic Federation. Those inclined to indulge in speculations may assume that H.'s father commanded the contingent<sup>20</sup> of Mytilene. The place where Hellanikos died having come down to us, it is at least not impossible that the time of his life, given as 85 years, has a certain claim to belief; at any rate what we know about the works of the author would be compatible with a dating of his life at c. 479/8 to 395/4 B.C.<sup>38</sup>).

<sup>25</sup> What we have obtained is very little, but even this little is important because it shows incontestably that H. was still active in the last quarter of the fifth century<sup>39</sup>). In this period falls the most original of his historical works, the Universal Chronicle of the 'Ιέρειαi and besides that the *Atthis* which primarily interests us here. These are the only two among<sup>30</sup> the more than twenty works of H. which we are able to date almost to the year. The latest quotation of the 'Ιέρειαi yields an event from the summer of 429 B.C.<sup>40</sup>), and when Thukydides 2, 2 dated the surprise attack on Plataiai by the words ἐπὶ Χρυσίδος ἐν Ἄργει τότε πενήτηντα δυοῖν δέοντα ἔτη ἱερωμένης καὶ Αἰνησίου ἐφόρου ἐν Σπάρτηι καὶ Πυθοδώρου<sup>35</sup> ἐπὶ ἑξήκοντα ἔτη ἀρχόντος Ἀθήνησι, the Chronicle must have been published<sup>41</sup>). We may assume unhesitatingly that this date, which marks the outbreak of the war precisely and impressively, belongs to Thukydides' old manuscript, *i.e.* it was written later than 421 B.C. but earlier than the Sicilian expedition. The contention that H. was used for this



period may be corroborated by the fact that Thukydides makes one of his rare digressions which do not concern the war, in writing of the year 423 B.C.: he records the fire in the temple of Hera in Argos, the flight of Chrysis and the appointment of her successor <sup>42</sup>). The inference is obvious that H., politically minded as he was, concluded the Universal Chronicle of the Greek people with the epochal date of the peace of Nikias. Of course this is merely a suggestion, but the fact that the end of the war is not dated by the priestess in Thukydides 5, 20 must not be adduced as contradicting: for the chapter does not mention any officials, only the natural seasons of the year, and Thukydides appends his reasons for rejecting *in toto* the method of dating by officials <sup>43</sup>).

As to the *Atthis*, F 25-26 prove that that work still treated in detail the events of the year 407/6 B.C. Here the inference is even more obvious that H. concluded with the epochal date of the end of the war in the last months of the year 404/3 B.C. A proof cannot be brought forward in this case either. It is of course conceivable that he recorded the later events of the year down perhaps to the establishment of the Thirty, or he may have regarded as epochal not the external end of the war but the restitution of democracy in 403/2. It does not make any difference that F 25-26 are quoted without the title of a book, for they cannot come from any but the *Atthis*. Nor need we waste our time with the wild conjectures which try to expel the name of H. from the text <sup>44</sup>) or with the speculation about a second edition of the *Atthis* published by his son Skamon <sup>45</sup>). For the *terminus post* obtained for the publication of the *Atthis* is confirmed by the contemporary evidence of Thukydides who before narrating the events which happened μεταξύ τοῦδε τοῦ πολέμου καὶ τοῦ Μηδικοῦ apologizes for what he himself admits to be a digression by giving his reasons for inserting it. In order to make a proper use of his words (printed in the text as T 8) for the literary activity of H. it is fortunately not necessary to enter the battlefield of the so-called Thucydidean Question. We need not ask at what precise moment the historian began to revise his manuscript, which now was to contain not only the Nikias War (which he had set out to describe εὐθὺς καθισταμένου) but the whole Twenty-Seven Years' War, the unity of which he maintains with the utmost energy in his second prooimion <sup>46</sup>). The context of I, 97 leaves no doubt that the few words relating to H. were added (to put it as cautiously as possible) as an afterthought to the motivation of the digression <sup>47</sup>). He gives two reasons: (1) that nobody had given an account of this period, all his forerunners having dealt

either with Greek History before the Persian War or with this war itself <sup>48</sup>); (2) that a detailed history of the missing period is fitted to show the development of the Athenian empire and its state at the moment when the conflict with Sparta came to a head. The afterthought consists 5 in a qualification of the first reason, and its very nature shows that it was added when the publication of a work which did *not* confine itself to the heroic age and did *not* stop with the Xerxes War put this first reason out of court. This explains why Thukydides mentions its author by name (which he does nowhere else) and why he criticises the book: 10 he is not inclined to cancel his own effort for its sake, or (as I believe) to give up his intention to write a real history of the period now covered by the Ἑλληνικῆ Ἱστορίᾳ of Hellanikos.

This is all the evidence we have of the literary career of H. It is certainly not much, and yet the fact that the Universal Chronicle as well as the 15 Chronicle of Athens was written in the last two decades of the fifth century, gives a starting-point for a conjectural reconstruction. Such an attempt can yield an acceptable result only if—taking into account the personality of the author as it emerges from the impression we get when we survey his whole work—we put forth a suggestion which I 20 submit is justified by the data. I hold that the Lesbian writer, in this respect not unlike Herodotos and Thukydides, began with a well defined programme, a self-imposed task, and that in the course of a perhaps long life this programme expanded in a rational manner. We are able to observe such a widening out of a formerly restricted circle of interest 25 and an eventual change of plan in the works of Herodotos and Thukydides. It is easier to observe in Hellanikos, who from the very beginning worked in what we may well term the new style of the sophists: unlike the philosophers and unlike Herodotos who collected the investigations of a whole life towards the end of this life in the compass of one great 30 book, H. published his results in works of a limited compass, which filled one, two, or at the outside (in the one case of the Universal Chronicle) three volumes, as the Alexandrine librarians divided them. His manner of working also differs from the later Charon <sup>49</sup>) who probably began with writing a chronicle of his native town Lampsakos and, in the course 35 of time, and under the influence of Hellanikos as well as of Herodotos became in a manner of speaking a professional historian. Like Herodotos, Hellanikos started from the historical performance of Hekataios, the first man to use the new form of prose-writing for the history of the Greek people in the heroic age (which till then had been the domain of

epic poetry) and for the description of the world and its inhabitants. But Herodotos broke new ground, leaving aside as settled by Hekataios <sup>50</sup>) the history of the heroic age and setting himself the task of collecting the traditions preserved from the century and a half preceding  
 5 the Persian Wars, and of composing as far as possible a history of the ἀνθρωπη(η λεγομένη γενεή <sup>51</sup>) under the historical aspect of the age-old conflict between Asia and Europe. Thus he created (or opened the way to) a new sense for the word ἱστορία. Hellenikos on his part (and this may have been his first and original plan) did exactly what Herodotos <sup>52</sup>)  
 10 refused to do: ἐγὼ δὲ περὶ μὲν τούτων οὐκ ἔρχομαι ἐρέων ὡς οὕτως ἢ ἄλλως κως ταῦτα ἐγένετο. He revised the work done by Hekataios and incidentally continued it in an enlarged and more systematic form, thus completing it and bringing the literary *genre* of mythography to perfection and in a manner of speaking to a conclusion <sup>53</sup>). In the five works (compris-  
 15 ing nine volumes as against the four of Hekataios' Ἱστορίαι) which dealt with the history of the heroic age from Deukalion to the Trojan War he seems to have collected the whole scattered and conflicting tradition about the pre-Trojan period, the πολλοὶ λόγοι Ἑλλήνων, arranging them in four or five great pedigrees, binding them together  
 20 by a well-conceived system of synchronisms, and crowning the whole genealogical combination by a narrative of the Trojan War as the first joint enterprise of the Greeks <sup>54</sup>). It is extremely probable that the work thus done impressed Thukydides who treated it as the background of his own appreciation of ancient Greece and as a historical foundation  
 25 for it <sup>55</sup>).

There is a second point of difference between Herodotos and Hellenikos in their relation to the first Greek historian, not so marked as the first (because no question of principle comes into play) but nevertheless observable. If Herodotos left aside the 'historical' work of Hekataios, touching only occasionally on the προτέρη γενεή—the ἀνδρῶν  
 30 ἡρώων θεῖον γένος, οἱ καλέονται ἡμιθέοι, as Hesiod has it <sup>56</sup>)—, there is no doubt at all that the starting-point for his own ἱστορίη was the 'geographical' work of the Milesian, which in describing the contemporary world of men probably often touched on historical events and on  
 35 monuments with a story attached to them <sup>57</sup>). It does not matter here whether Herodotos set out on his journeys with a plan of a new *Periodos* in his head <sup>58</sup>): the fact that his work, published probably after his death, contains the *disiecta membra* of a description of the known world is as obvious as that he collected his material on his own extensive

journeys, even if (for foreign countries) he drew more or less heavily on his predecessor. We have already mentioned <sup>50</sup>) that Hellanikos wrote special books about the same foreign countries and even more than we meet in what we now call the digressions of Herodotos, and in addition he published some 'Hellenic ethnographies' too. Their scanty remains do not contain evidence of autopsy even in the West; seemingly he did not undertake 'voyages of discovery' <sup>60</sup>), and the interest in geographical problems and in the map, so marked in some passages of Herodotos, is conspicuously absent from his work <sup>61</sup>). One cannot quite exclude the explanation that this state of things is due to insufficient preservation; but it is at least arguable that the character of these books was more historical than geographical. This conception appears probable if we compare the well defined structure of the several Herodotean λόγοι with their distinct historical element <sup>62</sup>). Ionian writers before Hellanikos and Herodotos had begun to develop from the *Periodos* a new genre of books dealing each with one people <sup>63</sup>). In these books the geographical (ethnographical) element must needs have become introductory to the history of each people which was narrated in detail, following (wherever possible) the series of kings. The two branches of learning, history and geography, began already to show a tendency to separate. Hellanikos cultivated the new genre extensively: he wrote at least six volumes about foreign, and at least seven about Greek countries <sup>64</sup>). Compared with the two volumes of Hekataios' *Periodos* and again with the 'digressions' of Herodotos the numbers alone are significant. It is most unfortunate that we cannot form a clear idea of Hellanikos' ethnographies; but the remains of the Περσικά seem to favour the hypothesis that their relation to the *Periodos* was the same as that existing between the genealogical books and the *Genealogiai*. Here too it was Hellanikos' aim to revise and enlarge the respective sections of the *Periodos*, adding (as a matter of principle and systematically) what was known of the history of those peoples or districts which he elected for special treatment <sup>65</sup>). The similarity to Herodotos in this respect is apparent; but Hellanikos did not think of connecting the several works by subordinating them to the historical ideas of a conflict between Asia and Europe or the growth of the Persian Empire. It remains an open question whether there was a certain coordination, as there certainly was in the genealogical works; but as to their form the several works were independent, ethnographies pure and simple. Concerning their time, we have no evidence at all. But the much discussed question whether Herodotos made use of any work of Hellanikos or

*vice versa* has yielded a definitely negative result for the former alternative <sup>66</sup>). As Herodotos made his journeys in the North and the East, say roughly between 460 and 446 B.C. <sup>67</sup>), it is almost certain that the Ethnographies of Hellanikos were not yet published. It is no more than a suggestion, but it seems to be a probable one that Hellanikos, after having finished his (let us call it so) new edition of Hekataios' 'Ἱστορίαι, turned to the second great work of his predecessor and dealt with it in the same manner. As far as we can see the new task did not compel him to leave his home for collecting material in foreign parts, though he may have visited the western coast of Asia Minor and penetrated even to Cyprus and Egypt <sup>68</sup>). He may have written, and he probably did write, the ethnographies as far as they deal with barbarian countries (we shall come back to the Hellenic ones) in his study and, at least partly, from books.

15 If we assume this to have been so (insufficiently founded though the assumption is), it would go far to explain a third and perhaps the most important difference between Hellanikos and Herodotos. It is indisputable that Greek Historiography in the specific and proper sense of the word begins with the *ἱστορίας ἀπόδειξις* of Herodotos who, in this sense, is  
 20 the true 'father of History'. It should be equally clear that the much more learned Lesbian is, in one sense, more of a historian than Herodotos. The latter stating the aim of his research with the famous words ἐγὼ δὲ περὶ μὲν τούτων οὐκ ἔρχομαι ἐρέων ὡς οὕτως ἢ ἄλλως κως ταῦτα ἐγένετο, τὸν δὲ οἶδα αὐτὸς πρῶτον ὑπάρξαντα ἀδίκων ἔργων ἐς τοὺς Ἕλληνας τοῦ-  
 25 τὸν σημήνας προβήσομαι ἐς τὸ πρόσω τοῦ λόγου κτλ. <sup>69</sup>), simply acknowledged the existence of two great periods in Greek history with a different tradition, the *προτέρη* (heroic) and the *ἀνθρωπηγή γενεή*, thus opening the way for the methodical criticism of the tradition by Thukydides. Hellanikos, on his part, not only recognized a *spatium vacuum* between  
 30 the history of Greece from Deukalion to the Trojan War and the ensuing migrations on the one hand and on the other the history of contemporary Greece, he also deliberately set himself the task of bridging this gulf of half a millennium. He did it in the 'Ἱερείαι τῆς Ἡρας αἱ ἐν Ἀργεῖ, his most extensive work, which was published some years after the  
 35 appearance of Herodotos' Histories <sup>70</sup>) and perhaps was only begun after Herodotos' work had been published in ca. 426 B.C. In three volumes it contained a continuous chronicle of the history of Greece in the wider sense of the word from its first beginnings down to the Nikias War <sup>71</sup>). This was something quite new, and the attempt at a continuous history

has, it is plain, profoundly impressed Thukydides. He made abundant use of it in his Archaeology and perhaps in the introduction to his *Σικελικά*, both sections being written after the probable date of publication of the *Ἰέρεια* <sup>73</sup>). Later on Ephoros followed up the first Universal Chronicle with the first (or, if not the first, the most important and authoritative) Universal History. Ephoros was a bookworm, who composed his great work almost exclusively from other books. This may have been the case with H. too, as long as he worked on the history of the heroic age and on most (if not all) histories of non-Greek peoples <sup>73</sup>). There must have been a change when he planned the *Ἰέρεια*. In order to write a Universal Chronicle in the time of the Nikias War much preliminary work was necessary. We are not able to say with assurance how many (if any) chronicles of Ionian cities were already published in the twenties of the fifth century <sup>74</sup>), but books about cities or districts of Greece proper certainly did not yet exist. There was much tradition contained in Herodotos about some of them in the last 200-250 years, but it was not enough for a continuous chronicle; one had to collect one's material on the spot. The special books which H. wrote about Thessaly, Boiotia, Athens, Argos, and Arkadia not only show that he was aware of the necessity of local investigation: the titles may even give us a sort of rough itinerary for his journeys in Greece proper <sup>75</sup>). Again we have no evidence about the time of most of these books, but as the *Ἰέρεια* was published after 421 B.C. and the *Atthis* after 407/6 we may assume that these books belong to the last period of H.s life: he may have visited Greece proper during the Ten Years' War or/and after the Nikias Peace. Perhaps it was about the same time that Thukydides decided to write the history of what he expected to be a 'great war', and that H., after having completed that part of his work which presented itself to us as a sort of re-writing of the two books of Hekataios, turned to the new task which may be regarded as the logical and obvious continuation of Hekataios' work, the bridging of the gulf which lay between those two works. The historian, perhaps famous at that time, now visited Greece proper and its most important places as Herodotos had done and as the sophists did; and it seems to be an almost self-evident assumption that, like Herodotos and the sophists, he lectured about the results of his earlier investigations as well as about the new material he collected in the several towns he visited <sup>76</sup>). There is no doubt that the general public everywhere was interested in the history and the antiquities of their own towns, and it is a matter of course for a man like H. that he published

his lectures in the form of Local Histories. In any case, it is an indisputable fact that it was the foreign sophist who gave to cities and districts of European Greece the first written and continuous report of their own past (and one may well add their present) history as distinguished from the digressions in Herodotos' work, which were not complete and not continuous; for, though in some cases covering a fair part of the ground, they omitted the heroic age and the dark centuries and generally broke off with the Xerxes War <sup>77</sup>).

I am quite aware that the preceding sketch of Hellanikos' life and literary activity is highly conjectural (though, perhaps, one may concede it some inherent probability), and it is not without a sense of relief that I return to surer ground and to the one work in which we are primarily interested here. From the *Atthis*, which was published after 407/6 and most probably after 404/3 <sup>78</sup>), twelve quotations are preserved and, including the quotations without a title, we have between twenty five and thirty fragments. The foreign writer must have done his work extremely well. Not till about half a century later did an Athenian ἐξηγητής write what Pausanias seems to term 'the first Atthis' <sup>79</sup>); and if he aimed at supplanting H. (which is doubtful, though the Athenians granted him a special reward for his book) he did not meet with success. H.s *Atthis* was used—leaving aside Thukydidēs, Ephoros and some doubtful cases <sup>80</sup>)—in the fourth century by Andron <sup>81</sup>) and Amelesagoras <sup>82</sup>); it was quoted in the third century by Diodoros Periegetes <sup>83</sup>). Further, Scholiasts and Lexicographers invoke its authority in the same manner as that of the Athenian Atthidographers <sup>84</sup>) e.g. for events before the reign of Kekrops <sup>85</sup>), for the history of Athenian families <sup>86</sup>), even for Athenian cults or rather for their aitia <sup>87</sup>). The esteem the work still enjoyed in Roman times clearly emerges from the fact that Plutarch in his *Life of Theseus* quoted it five times <sup>88</sup>) (whether from Istros or from his own knowledge) as against two quotations from Kleidemos and one from Demon, none from Androtion, Phanodemos, Melanthios. Philochoros is quoted six times and used more extensively than the quotations indicate, but H.s presentation of Theseus was evidently regarded as next to his the greatest authority and as a primary source. It is very likely that Philochoros' narrative of the reign, and particularly of the expulsion of Theseus, was built to a large extent on H. <sup>89</sup>). A second fact points in the same direction: the fragments preserved from H.s *Atthis* far exceed in number those taken from the books of Melanthios and Demon and even those from the digest made by Istros (if we leave

aside the non-narrative *Atakta*); the total is about the same as that of the quotations from Kleidemos or Phanodemos. This state of things cannot be explained merely by the (surely important) fact that H. was the first to write an *Atthis*; the book must have possessed intrinsic value 5 which made the Athenian writers take it as their model, probably revising and certainly enlarging it from their more intimate knowledge of their national antiquities, but taking over its general arrangement and much of its contents. We shall probably not be far wrong if we state that in the Hellenistic and even in the Roman period the most highly esteemed 10 and authoritative *Atthides* were the three written by Hellanikos, Androtion, and Philochoros which are intimately connected by the political and rationalistic treatment of the *ἀρχαιολογία*.

We must try to get a picture of the work from the fragments, few as (after all) they are. The words of Thukydides quoted above and the 15 fragments leave no doubt that the Ἀττικὴ ξυγγραφή—as Thukydides calls it <sup>90</sup>), the Ἀτθίς as later writers quote it <sup>91</sup>)—contained the whole history of Athens from the earliest times down to (probably) the end of the Peloponnesian War <sup>92</sup>). The treatment was circumstantial enough to fill two volumes of the later type <sup>93</sup>). It is, of course, not surprising 20 that H. knew more about Athens, or that he was more interested in that city (where he may have sojourned for a longer time and more than once) than he was in Thessaly, Boiotia, Arkadia, or even Argos, which seem to have been treated each in one volume only. But now as before <sup>94</sup>) I am not prepared to believe in four (or even five <sup>95</sup>)) volumes on the 25 strength of F 7 where I regard the  $\bar{\Delta}$  as an evident error of a scribe for  $\delta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\iota$ —as easy and almost as frequent a mistake as the dittography of a  $\bar{\tau}$  after the  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\eta\iota$  of a quotation which would give twelve books to the *Atthides* of Kleidemos and Androtion <sup>96</sup>). I have to discuss the question because on account of our scanty knowledge of the contents of the second 30 book <sup>97</sup>) we cannot *disprove* that the mention of the Megarian Pegai, belonging either to 462/1 B.C. (or a later year of the First Peloponnesian War) or to 428/7 occurred in a fourth book. But the supposition of two books for the history of the fifth century (say from the end of the Xerxes War on) or (if there were five books) of two for the Peloponnesian War 35 alone is so extremely improbable that it almost amounts to an *a priori* impossibility. The former alternative is excluded at once by Thukydides' criticism that H. treated the Pentekontaetia *βραχέως*, whatever that means—his sketch of the period is not very helpful for guessing at his own idea of an appropriate treatment. One may think it probable that H.



confined himself to the facts, not expounding their internal connexion and not admitting digressions about leading persons such as Pausanias and Themistokles; there may even have been years to which not one event was assigned <sup>98</sup>). The second alternative is perhaps less incredible <sup>5</sup> *a priori*: the interest of the writer in the great contemporary war might furnish a reason for a very circumstantial narration of it; and one might compare the position of the Xerxes War and the very detailed narration of it in the work of Herodotos. But this supposition brings us dangerously near to the new Thucydidean view-point about the unity of the Twenty-  
<sup>10</sup> seven-years' War. It is hard to believe that H., who had already written a fairly detailed exposition of the Nikias War in the *Ἱέρειαι*, anticipated the great discovery of Thukydides later on: I even venture to assert that <sup>5, 26</sup> puts this supposition out of court. Even the Universal Chronicle comprised only three volumes. The quotations too do not favour the  
<sup>15</sup> belief in the soundness of the  $\delta$  in F 7; there is only one quotation from the alleged fourth book, and none at all from the third or the fifth. It further seems incredible that a three-volume history of the fifth century, written by a highly esteemed author like H., should have disappeared completely, leaving no vestige in our tradition, just as it is incredible  
<sup>20</sup> that an *Atthis* of the fifth century should have had the same dimensions as that of Kleidemos or even greater: the latter work appeared fifty years later and was quickly doubled by Androtion, who in his turn was doubled by Philochoros. There is a steady and natural rise in the extent of these Athenian histories <sup>99</sup>). Even apart from the Thucydidean  
<sup>25</sup> *βραχέως* the extant fragments make the assumption of four or five books improbable and favour the two, for it is obviously easy to arrange them in a two-book scheme. The evidence is this: our sources quote from the first book the institution of the Areopagos <sup>100</sup> (probably in the reign of Kekrops) and that of the Panathenaia under Erechthonios <sup>101</sup>,  
<sup>30</sup> perhaps also the Eleusinian War under Erechtheus <sup>102</sup>). This leaves no doubt that the first book dealt with the history of the Athenian kings. We are in a less secure position for the second book. But it seems obvious that F 6 refers to the reform of Kleisthenes <sup>103</sup>, and then F 5 may well refer to the last years of Hippias who fortified Munychia; F 8-9 we cannot  
<sup>35</sup> date with certainty. We have to admit that this evidence is scanty <sup>104</sup>): we could not disprove the assumption founded on the  $\delta$  of F 7 that the first or the second Peloponnesian War was treated in the fourth book, and we do not learn from the fragments where the borderline between the first and the second book ran, or (better) where H. made the break

between the archaeology and the history which the librarians probably used for their book-division later on. There is no real proof, there is only a question of probability. We get a probable arrangement <sup>106</sup>) if we assume that H. obtained the archon list in Athens and was the first to publish it—an assumption which I regard as a fact and for which I shall argue presently. The archon list was a historical document of the first order, and it was obvious that 'history' began with the first annual archon. If H. marked the break (and he could not but do so) <sup>106</sup>) and if the librarians used it to divide the book into volumes (as one expects them to have done) the first volume contained the history of Athens under the kings (we may call it the archaeology) and the second the history of 'republican' Athens—the little known of the seventh century (Kylon, Drakon), the history of the sixth century (Solon, tyrants, Kleisthenes), and the whole of the fifth century (Persian Wars, Pentekontaetia, Peloponnesian War).

Then βραχέως needs no further justification: we have only to state that the criticism would apply not only to the period to which Thukydides in his context naturally applies it, but to the whole history of historical Athens; and one easily understands why H. is often quoted for the Athens of the kings and seldom for the historical period <sup>107</sup>).

This reconstruction of the *Atthis* (if a 'theory of probabilities' is entitled to that somewhat pretentious name) is, of course, largely influenced by my firm conviction that H. arranged his material in the second part of his work under the headings of the archons' names, as in the first part he arranged it under the names of the kings for the whole period during which Athens was governed by them. For this fundamental assumption I rely, of course, in the first instance, on F 25-26, which in my opinion are sufficient proof of it <sup>108</sup>). Confidence in the inference to be drawn from the two fragments is strengthened by the finding in the Agora of part of an archon list which was publicly exhibited in the market-place about 425 B.C. <sup>109</sup>). I refuse to be drawn here into a discussion as to whether this list began with Solon 594/3 or with Kreon 683/2 B.C. <sup>110</sup>). However one decides about the historicity of the first archon's person and name, or about the authenticity and completeness of the first part of the list, the fact remains that our tradition knows of only one archon list; that the list began with Kreon; that (as far as we know) there was no variant in the years and names of the archons between him and Solon, let alone in the date of the latter's archonship <sup>111</sup>). Taking all things together, the assumption is self-evident that H. used this list as the backbone of his 'book about Athens' and that he joined it with the

king-list, or rather that he extended the list of the kings down to 684/3 B.C., thus constructing a continuous list of eponyms. I am sorry if I sound dogmatical, but there is really no need for over-cautious qualifications. Leaving open the question whether what obtains for Athens obtains also for H.'s other 'Greek ethnographies' (which in my opinion it does not <sup>113</sup>) and referring to my treatment of the general form of the *Atthides* <sup>113</sup>) I confidently state that later writers were justified in quoting the 'book about Athens' as 'Ἀρθίς, that it was a chronicle, and that H. was the creator of that form and, in fact, the first Atthidographer, whatever Pausanias' meant when he called Kleidemos ὁπσοῖ τὰ Ἀθηναίων ἐπιχώρια ἐγραψαν ὁ ἀρχαῖότατος <sup>114</sup>). To write such a book was natural for a man who, of course, was acquainted with the earliest Ionian ὄροι, as far as there were any <sup>115</sup>), and who himself had published some fifteen years before a chronicle of all Greece, bringing order into a chaos by the simple device of attaching facts and events to a certain name and a certain year in the list of the priestesses of Hera at Argos, and adding for the sake of convenience synchronisms with, or relations to, a great epochal event: τὸ μὲν δὴ Σικελικὸν γένος οὕτως ἐξέλιπεν Ἰταλῶν, ὡς Ἑλλάνικος ὁ Λέσβιος φησί, τρίτη γενεᾷ πρότερον τῶν Τρωικῶν, Ἀλκυόνης ἱερωμένης ἐν Ἀργεῖ κατὰ τὸ ἕκτον καὶ εἰκοστὸν ἔτος . . . τὸν δὲ μετὰ τοῦτον (*scil.* στόλον) ἔτει πέμπτῳ γενόμενον Αὐσονῶν κτλ <sup>116</sup>). From the same work comes F 22, where H. noted the trial of Orestes before the Areopagos and incidentally enumerated the earlier actions before that court, dating them by their distance in γενεαί from the one, so to speak, Panhellenic trial <sup>117</sup>). The list of priestesses he obtained in Argos, as he obtained the musical victors at the Karneia in Sparta (either himself if he visited the town, or by a friend whom he asked to transcribe it for him). It is inconceivable (at least to my mind) that in Athens the expert historian, when planning a work which called for the like arrangement, should have either not asked for such lists or scorned to use them, when his Athenian friends (such friends being again a matter of course) furnished him with them or directed his attention to the Agora list <sup>118</sup>). It is true, that in Athens he had to work with two lists: there was a continuous list of archons for almost three centuries, and there was a list of kings, which he either received from the same λόγοι ἀνδρες, or (more probably) constructed himself from various *data*, particularly the names of kings connected with monuments or occurring in the many stories which were doubtless told him <sup>119</sup>). He had to join these two lists and to fit them into the universal chronology which he had followed

(or rather worked out himself) in the genealogical works and in the 'Iéπειαι. We shall not go here into the details of his list, because none of the single problems can be solved with full assurance and none bears upon the question of principle: whether his list of kings began with 5 Kekrops, Aktaios or Ogygos, and whether he gave the list of pre-Kekropian kings which Philochoros rejected <sup>120</sup>); how many pre-Trojan kings his list comprised <sup>121</sup>); how many of them he got in Athens and how many he had to promote to royal dignity or to invent wholly; how he calculated the duration of their reigns (it cannot be doubted that he did <sup>122</sup>)); 10 how many names Attic tradition gave him for the 'dark centuries' after the Ionic migration; whether they were sufficient to bridge the gap between Medon and Kreon, or whether he had to draw here rather heavily on his own resources of imagination and invention <sup>123</sup>); whether it was already H. who introduced the conception of ἀρχοντες δεκαετείς <sup>124</sup>, 15 and so on. The fragments, as stated, do not help: they contain a few names of pre-Trojan <sup>125</sup>) and some more of post-Trojan kings <sup>126</sup>), but none later than Medon and the Ionic migration. It is probable that the fundamental synchronism between the sack of Troy and the last year of Menestheus <sup>127</sup>) occurred already in the *Atthis* and it may have been 20 first put forward by H. <sup>128</sup>). The sequence of the four kings Thymoites, Melanthos, Kodros, Medon, furnished by F 23, recurs in the later lists. H. certainly did not regard Theseus or Kodros as the last king; but the possibility that the Hellenistic chronographers tampered with the list of the δεκαετείς <sup>129</sup>) makes it impossible to pronounce with any confidence 25 about the last part of his list.

As to the question of principle, nobody (as stated above) has openly denied that H. used the list of kings for dating early events <sup>130</sup>). I submit that nobody would have doubted the regular use of the archon list from 683/2 B.C. onward for the same purpose (which, in view of the scanty 30 tradition for the seventh, the sixth, and even the fifth century may well mean that for more or less extensive stretches the *Atthis* was confined to a naked list of eponyms <sup>131</sup>)) if it had not been for the criticism of Thukydides that H. had dealt with the Pentekontaetia not only βραχέως but also τοῖς χρόνοις οὐκ ἀκριβῶς. This misleads the modern scholar. 35 He for his part is glad and grateful if tradition gives him an archon date for a fifth century event: for all its vagaries (which modern investigations have remedied to a not inconsiderable degree) the Athenian calendar enables him to fix the events themselves with an approach to accuracy, and (what is sometimes more important) to find out their relative order.

To him therefore it seems incredible that Thukydides should have objected to this manner of dating, and he infers that H. (at least in the Pentekontaetia) did *not* date by archons <sup>133</sup>). Some scholars do so with a certain hesitation, perhaps because, after all, we do have two archon dates from the year 407/6 B.C., and it is difficult to believe that H. used them only in the narrative of the Peloponnesian War, and equally difficult to imagine how he dated in the Pentekontaetia and before. For even Herodotos, who is anything but a chronographer, gives the archon for the arrival of Xerxes in Attika <sup>133</sup>). Nevertheless, modern scholars draw the conclusion. This is a most curious example of the weight of prejudice and preconceived ideas which do not realize the possibility of different outlooks, but disregard even obvious facts: Thukydides is a master of accuracy, and (though a somewhat severe critic) he is 'an honorable man', and if he declares that H. was inaccurate, then inaccurate he was. If modern scholars simply inferred, as some have done <sup>134</sup>), that H. made mistakes (perhaps many) in assigning events to the wrong archon years I should not quarrel with the conclusion, but simply state that we are not able to put the matter to the test, as we have not one date of H. for the period criticised by Thukydides. I should however be prepared to rely on Thukydides' judgment <sup>135</sup>), if he really meant what scholars believe he did. But in my belief they interpret Thukydides' statement wrongly: the general opinion is mistaken because based on a fundamental syllogism of which the premises are at fault as well as the deduction. The real premises are: (1) H. dates by archons, as is shown by general considerations and confirmed by F 25/6; (2) Thukydides declares that H. wrote τοῖς χρόνοις οὐκ ἀκριβῶς. The evident conclusion is that Thukydides, when he criticised H., regarded the method of dating by archons as inaccurate. In fact, this circumstantial reasoning is superfluous, for we *know* that he did. For the war he was going to describe he created his own chronology, narrating the events ὡς ἕκαστα ἐγένετο κατὰ θέρος καὶ χειμῶνα <sup>136</sup>). He had to date, of course, the first year (and the last) unmistakably, and he did it not by the archon alone, for he was not writing a local history, but by a combination of official years and intervals, adding the calendar-time to fix the outbreak as accurately as possible <sup>137</sup>). That is as it should be. But we are surprised that neither in the narration of the αἰτίαι καὶ προφάσεις (I, 23-88) nor in the great digression (I, 89-118), which contains also the *Pentekontaetia*, we find an absolute date, either an official or a natural one; nor yet is an interval given such as the distance between the Fifty-Year-Treaty

and the outbreak of the war <sup>138</sup>). Then, in concluding the history of the Nikias War <sup>139</sup>), Thukydides goes out of his way to denounce the official reckoning by archons (which was also the reckoning of H.): αὐται αἱ σπονδαὶ ἐγένοντο τελευτῶντος τοῦ χειμῶνος ἅμα ἤρι, ἐκ Διονυσίων εὐθύς

5 τῶν ἀστικῶν, αὐτόδεκα ἐτῶν διελθόντων καὶ ἡμερῶν ὀλίγων παρενεγκουσῶν ἢ ὡς τὸ πρῶτον ἢ ἐσβολῇ ἢ ἐς τὴν Ἀττικὴν καὶ ἡ ἀρχὴ τοῦ πολέμου τοῦδε ἐγένετο. σκοπεῖτω δέ τις κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους καὶ μὴ τῶν ἐκασταχοῦ ἢ ἀρχόντων ἢ ἀπὸ τιμῆς τινὸς τὴν ἀπαριθμησιν τῶν ὀνομάτων <sup>140</sup>) ἐς τὰ προγεγεννημένα σημαινόντων πιστεύσας <sup>141</sup>) μᾶλλον· οὐ γὰρ ἀκριβές ἐστιν,

10 οἷς καὶ ἀρχομένοις καὶ μεσοῦσι καὶ ὅπως ἐτυχέ τωι ἐπεγένετό τι. κατὰ θέρη δὲ καὶ χειμῶνας ἀριθμῶν, ὥσπερ γέγραπται, εὐρήσει, ἐξ ἡμισείας ἑκατέρου τοῦ ἑνιαυτοῦ τὴν δύναμιν ἔχοντος, δέκα μὲν θέρη, ἴσους δὲ χειμῶνας τῶι πρῶτῳ πολέμῳ τῶιδε γεγεννημένους. Comparing (as one has to do) this closing chapter with that at the beginning (2, 2) and leaving aside the

15 thorny problem concerning the respective length of summer and winter, because it does not matter here, we state what is, or should be, obvious. Thukydides corrects his own initial chapter in three points: (1) as the beginning of the war he does not any longer regard the surprise attack on Plataiai, as he evidently did when he wrote the impressive words

20 ἀρχεται δὲ ὁ πόλεμος ἐνθένδε ἤδη Ἀθηναίων καὶ Πελοποννησίων καὶ τῶν ἑκατέρου ξυμμάχων (adding his definition of the notion πόλεμος) and followed them up with the equally impressive date for the first event of the war <sup>142</sup>). He now associates the outbreak of the war with the first

25 ὁ πρῶτος πόλεμος ὅδε οἱ ὁ δεκαετῆς πόλεμος <sup>145</sup>); (3) in place of the complicated date for the original commencement of the war, consisting of intervals, eponyms and the time of the natural year (ἅμα ἤρι ἀρχομένῳ) we find only the last ingredient—τελευτῶντος τοῦ χειμῶνος ἅμα ἤρι—, supplemented (rather inconsistently) <sup>146</sup>) by the reference to a widely

30 known Athenian festival. We are concerned here with the third point alone. Thukydides follows up the computation of the duration of 'the first war' from its new beginning to the peace treaty with a weighty protest against the usual reckoning by eponyms—that is, by official years—expounding its disadvantages for dating single events, and asserting that the length of a period can be rightly computed only by adding

35 up the number of winters and summers. Concerning his polemics we may say that Thukydides has not so much changed his own method for narrating a contemporary war and dating its events—he simply re-affirms here, and gives his reasons for, a method which he had announced plainly

in 2, 1. But he has become aware of a problem which emerges when one has to compute the duration of a war: the first war, reckoned in natural years, lasted almost exactly (that is, not quite) ten years, but the ἀκριβήσις τῶν δνομάτων from Pythodoros in 432/1 to Alkaios in 422/1 B.C. amounts to eleven archons' years. It is on account of this discrepancy that Thukydides rejects the use of official years for computing the length of a period (apart from its disadvantages in dating single events). He does it for the same reason, and using the same expression, as in his criticism of H.: οὐ γὰρ ἀκριβές ἐστίν. He had not yet become aware of this point when he wrote 5, 25, 1, dating as he does the treaty and the alliance with Sparta, and incidentally the end of the Ten-Years War, by the Athenian archon and the Spartan ephor. But we will not (and need not) discuss the 'Thucydidean Question'. At whatever point he recognized that the Peace of Nikias was no real peace and realized that the Sicilian expedition and the Deceleian War were parts of the same great conflict<sup>147</sup>; at whatever point he embarked on his new plan and began to write the 'History of the Twenty-Seven Years' War'<sup>148</sup>, using his old manuscript or rather manuscripts, working in his new view-points here and there, bridging the gap between the Peace of Nikias and the Sicilian War—various views on these questions do not affect the obvious fact that the criticism of H. in 1, 97 and the rejection of the method of dating by archons (which *was* the method of H.) in 5, 20, result from the same trend of thought. It does not follow that both passages were written at the same time; 5, 20 may be much older, though, in fact, I do not believe it is<sup>149</sup>). But it does not matter for us. What matters is again an obvious fact *viz.* that the short criticism in 1, 97 (which has shocked or bewildered modern scholars) becomes at once understandable from the elaborate criticism in 5, 20. Whether or not the criticism in 5, 20 is directed at H.<sup>150</sup> there is no doubt that it applies to him, because he had used archons' years for dating events in the *Atthis*, as he had used the years of the priestesses of Hera in the *Ἱερείαι*<sup>151</sup>). We may well be dissatisfied with the lazy minds of the Atthidographers, who did not trouble about the objections raised by Thukydides, and very seldom even added a calendar date; the fact is so. As long as Athenian history was written, its authors followed the example set by H., the first Atthidographer<sup>152</sup>). The system had its draw-backs for the fifth, fourth, and third centuries B.C.; for the earlier times and for say the first half even of the fifth century there was no better alternative.

I should not like to conclude with no other result of my argumentation

than this (which, after all, if not negative, is largely external) that H. created the form for recording Athenian history, the literary εἶδος of the *Atthis*; and that it was only natural for this kind of record to rationalize or, better, to historize and modernize <sup>153</sup>) mythical history. The criticism of Thukydidēs whose appreciation <sup>154</sup>) seems somewhat reluctant (τούτων δὲ ὁσπερ καὶ ἤψατο) does not do that achievement full justice. This is not meant as a reproach to Thukydidēs, for he was not writing a review of the new book for the *Classical Review*; he briefly remarked upon the fact that a certain part of it did not make superfluous his own account of the

10 Pentekontaetia, conceived in a truly historical spirit. But I think that I formerly answered too hastily and too negatively the question about the intrinsic value of the *Atthis* when saying that 'H. hardly had the intimate connexion with Athens which moved Herodotos: he was occupied with far too many places in the same manner. He wrote really as an

15 alien' <sup>155</sup>). Surely it means more than this, that a man from a town which had belonged to the Attic Empire was the first to write a book on the history of Athens. He did so at a time when the Samians changed the name of their 'Ἡραία to Λυσάνδρεια <sup>156</sup>); when the Samian Ion composed the victory inscription for Lysander's statue at Delphi <sup>157</sup>); when another Samian, Choirilos, began an epic poem about his exploits; when

20 Antimachos of Kolophon and poets from other towns of the Empire strove for the favour of Lysander and the new masters of the Greek world; when the Milesian Timotheos dissolved the connexion between Ionia and her mother town <sup>158</sup>), a connexion acknowledged since the times

25 of Solon <sup>159</sup>), emphasized by Herodotos <sup>160</sup>) and upheld by H. <sup>161</sup>). Perhaps this last fact is of less importance: any author who did write an *Atthis* had to set forth Athenian tradition and, whether incidentally or deliberately, thus to plead the claims of Athens to be acknowledged in the Greek world <sup>162</sup>). The decisive point is *that* he wrote an *Atthis*,

30 and that he wrote it at that very time. A man who did that cannot have been hostile to Athens. Her enemies either turned to the new sun, or they wrote pamphlets against the mistress of the destroyed Empire. H. cannot have been one of the displeased conservatives who, since the failure of the Sicilian expedition, conspired against democratic Athens,

35 rather he sympathized with the men who restored democracy in 403/2 B.C. <sup>163</sup>). But perhaps we may make use of the fact that according to the fragments, in which Solon's name is lacking (perhaps accidentally), the constitution of Kleisthenes was dealt with in detail. I do not any longer doubt that H. wrote his book with a deep feeling of sympathy,



and perhaps with the hope of a better future, for Athens. This is the point where Thukydides and H. touch, though the former saw into things much more deeply: for Thukydides—one might say—Athens had died with Perikles because that statesman had not found a worthy successor. Perhaps we may assume Thukydides to have felt somehow that H.s *Atthis* also was a monument for his beloved Athens and that its author was worth mention, even if in the gloom which beset Thukydides' mind during those years the feeling of a certain sympathy found its expression mainly in the form of criticism.

10

## T(ESTIMONIES)

(1-8) I have given only a selection of the testimonia, those that concern the *Atthis* and the dates of the authors' life.

(1) About his native country, his father and the manner of his death see Introduction nn. 20, 22, 23, 163. The two names of Macedonian kings may have been cited in the Chronicle of Apollodoros <sup>1)</sup>: in his chronology H.s birth falls under Amyntas I, who reigned (according to Diodoros) 532/1-484/3 B.C. <sup>2)</sup>, and his death under Perdikkas, who reigned 439/8-418/7 B.C. (?). The source of the Suda used a chronicle in which the succinct Vita given by Apollodoros had been entered under a year of Amyntas, and either the source or the Suda abridged it unduly. In consequence H.s birth under Amyntas became fused with his sojourn in Macedonia <sup>3)</sup>. Whether Apollodoros gave the name of the king under whom that sojourn took place must remain open. Again according to his chronology the *floruit* of H. (456/5 B.C.) falls in the reign of Amyntas' son Alexandros I Philhellen (483/2-440/39), under whom Herodotos may have visited Macedonia <sup>4)</sup>. These dates show that no alterations must be made in the names; and (even more important) that we must not expect to extract from them any genuine tradition about H.s life <sup>5)</sup>. A visit of H. to Macedonia is not *a priori* impossible <sup>6)</sup>, but it is not probable as he did not write Μακεδονικά. Nor does the biographic tradition inspire confidence: it may be taken from one of the fourth century dialogues which—sometimes of set purpose—favour the Macedonian claims to civilisation. The framework of them must not be taken any more seriously than that of the Platonic dialogues <sup>7)</sup>.

(2) See on *F Gr Hist* 1 T 16-19. That the grouping is based on style is even more distinct in Cicero than in Dionysios. The gram-

marians who wrote about literary κλοπή did not keep to this arrangement (see Introd. n. 66). In T 8 the words τοῖς πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἄπασιν merely signify that the *Atthis* (like the greater part of H.'s works) had been published when Thukydides was still writing his history. Charon is a younger contemporary of H.: see *Studi It.* N.S. 15, 1938, p. 207 ff.

(3) The bad synchronism which confuses the birth and the *floruit* presumably fixed the chronological position of H. according to Apollodoros.

(4) See above p. 4, 8 ff.

(5) *Ph. U.* 16, 1902, p. 277 ff.; *F Gr Hist* 244 F 7.

(7) See on 330 T 4. The reference to the *Atthis* cannot be doubted.

(8) See Introd. p. 5, 12 ff.; 12, 13 ff.; 16, 26 ff.

### F(RAGMENTS)

- (1) The contents and the form of this fragment compared with the series of trials enumerated in F 22 prove that it comes from the *Atthis*.
- 15 The two interpretations of the name Ἄρειος πάγος occur together also in Steph. Byz. s.v., who quotes Apollodoros ἐν τῷ Περι θεῶν θ<sup>1</sup>) for the first, Philochoros ἐν Ἀτθίδος β<sup>2</sup>) for the second. We may take it that in the complete article H. and Philochoros were quoted alongside of each other, as in F 2 H. and Androtion are <sup>3</sup>). Only H. preserved the ritual action of the πηγύναι δόρυ which Istros mentions on the occasion of the trial of Kephalos <sup>4</sup>). Istros alone mentioned (presumably when relating the Orestes trial) the altar of Athena Areia, which is said to have been established by Orestes, and the ἀργοὶ λίθοι, ἐφ' ὧν ἐστᾶσιν ὄσοι δίκας ὑπέχουσι καὶ οἱ δῖάκοντες; the stones are called Ὑβρεως and Ἄναυδείας <sup>5</sup>). As Euripides <sup>6</sup>) speaks periphrastically of these stones we may assume that H. knew and mentioned them. There seems to be no difference in the tradition about the external facts connected with the procedure before the Areopagos, and it is almost certain that all *Atthides* enumerated the same four mythical trials <sup>7</sup>). The monuments which H. saw, and which seemed to guarantee the reality of happenings, are those most likely to have been mentioned; his is the manner of the Ionian ἱστορίη which, in front of the monuments, asks for their history and receives it from the λόγοι ἄνδρες. That the other homicide courts and their aitia are not mentioned in the fragments may be accidental. But we can hardly assume that in his second book H. discussed the range of cases brought before the Areopagos, the composition, the proceedings and the history of that court of justice as Philochoros did and Androtion

before him in connexion with the legislation of Solon <sup>8</sup>). It also remains uncertain how far it was possible to infer the history of the Areopagos from the detached notes of which H.'s *Atthis* consisted. We cannot suppose that he went into the details of the party-warfare <sup>9</sup>) and the first attempts  
 5 at restoring the earlier competence of that body; but we do expect in his work a note on the year 462/1 B.C. where the later *Atthides* entered the fundamental reform of Ephialtes who changed the 'House of Lords' into a court for cases of homicide <sup>10</sup>). The term *ἐπιθετα* in Aristotle seems to show that even for his main Atthidographic source the Areopagos originally was nothing but a homicide court <sup>11</sup>), or at least that no concern  
 10 was felt as to its position during the mythical period, the earliest of its existence.

The first traditional fact which we have to take into account in order to judge the statements of H. is this: the Areopagos was established as  
 15 a homicide court according to a completely uniform tradition and existed as such probably throughout the whole period of the kings. It was, according to this uniform tradition, the constitution of Solon (or the alleged constitution of Drakon <sup>12</sup>)) which first assigned other functions to the Areopagos, particularly the *νομοφυλακία*. At this point begins the  
 20 controversy about the extent of these functions, inspired by party policy. One side assumes a pre-Solonian state of affairs when the Areopagos even commissioned the officials; the other maintains that the Areopagos was created by Solon <sup>12a</sup>). The second fact is that according to the tradition about the four mythical trials which is known to H. all  
 25 kinds of homicide came before the Areopagos: φόνος δίκαιος (Ares, Orestes), φόνος ἀκούσιος (Kephalos), φόνος ἐκ προνοίας (Daidalos) <sup>13</sup>). Here however another tradition exists which takes into account the fact that in historical times there existed four or five courts for homicide, and which consequently produces an appropriate aition for each of them <sup>14</sup>).  
 30 According to this tradition also, the Areopagos is the oldest homicide court; chronologically the next, established under Erechtheus and not quite of the same class, is the δικαστήριον ἐν πρυτανείῳ καλούμενον, ἔνθα τῶι σιδήρῳι καὶ πᾶσιν ὁμοίως τοῖς ἀψόχοις δικάζουσιν <sup>15</sup>). The three remaining courts were not established until Aigeus and Demophon:  
 35 (1) the court ἐπὶ Δελφινίῳ (established for Theseus) judges ἐργάσασθαι φόνον σὸν τῶι δικαίῳ φαμένους <sup>16</sup>). From the time of the Nostoi derive (2) the court ἐπὶ Παλλαδίῳ where τοῖς ἀποκτείνασιν ἀκουσίως κρίσις καθέστηκε <sup>17</sup>) and (3) the court of justice ἐν Φρεαττοῖ <sup>18</sup>). If such a proceeding were methodically permissible (which it is not) <sup>19</sup>) it would be easy enough

to bring those two traditions into chronological agreement: when Ares committed his φόνος δίκαιος the Delphinion did not yet exist; when Kephalos killed Prokris by mistake, there was not yet a Palladion; and for Daidalos' deed (in the reign of Aigeus) which was a φόνος ἐκ  
5 πρῶτης, the Areopagos was competent. But the trial of Orestes cannot be made to conform: being a φόνος δίκαιος it ought to have been brought before the Delphinion, which existed since the time of Theseus. H. knew the four trials of the myth already when he wrote the 'Ἰέπειαι<sup>20)</sup>: we may safely say that it was he who first arranged in a group these stories  
10 originally independent of each other, and brought them into a chronological system. Three points must be taken into account: (1) what H. enters and dates is the trial of the Argive Orestes; he mentions the three Attic trials in a retrospective digression dating them, without giving the names of the Athenian kings, merely by their distances from the Orestes trial;  
15 (2) he places the Ares trial in the beginning of Attic history, most probably under the first king Kekrops<sup>21)</sup>; (3) to this dating of the first trial he keeps in the *Atthis* and he gives the corresponding etymology or, as one might say, the corresponding aition. In making these statements he puts himself—and the entire Atthidography with him—in opposition to  
20 Aischylos, as according to the poet the court of justice on the Areopagos was first established for the case of Orestes: κλύουσ' ἂν ἤδη θεσμὸν Ἀττικὸς λεώς/ πρώτας δίκας κρίνοντες αἵματος χυτοῦ (*Eum.* 681/2). Accordingly Aischylos adds the unique digression 683 ff., in which he supplies a new etymology excluding the trial of Ares (and incidentally the trials of  
25 Kephalos and Daidalos) from the history of the Areopagos. There is no doubt that he did so on purpose and that the etymology is his invention: the spectators were to forget what they had believed until then that the Areopagos had always existed. The etymology makes impossible the inference that Aischylos did not know the other  
30 trials because they were invented later<sup>22)</sup>. Only a widely different inference seems to be possible, *viz.* that Aischylos audaciously rejected in favour of his own invention the rôle of the Areopagos in the three old stories which had not yet been arranged in a systematic series. In my opinion the invention consists in this *that Aischylos was the first*  
35 *to bring Orestes before the Areopagos*<sup>23)</sup>. Only if this assumption is made (which is contradicted nowhere in the tradition)<sup>24)</sup> does it become intelligible that he places in post-Trojan times the origin of an institution which was believed to be as old as the ages; that he chooses to ignore the existing judicial practice in Athens by bringing Orestes, who is

pleading justified homicide, before the Areopagos instead of before the Delphinion; that although he makes the Areopagos later than it was in Athenian tradition, which dated its establishment under the first king, he gives a history of its development, which increases the glory of the democratically reformed institution in the view of the Athenians. Personally I have no serious doubt that Aischylos (to put it roughly) wrote his trilogy because of the Areopagos; that he composed his poem under the influence and because of (to use a neutral term) the reform of 462/1 B.C. <sup>25</sup>). Nor have I any doubt that he (again to put it roughly) defends the democratic restriction of the old Council to jurisdiction in cases of homicide because that was the function Athena had assigned to it, additional functions falling under the concept *ἐπιθετα* as Ephialtes terms it and/or Aristotle <sup>26</sup>). The invention was extremely bold, even though it found a slight support in the fact that both Homer <sup>27</sup>) and Attic tradition <sup>28</sup>) knew of an earlier connexion of Orestes with Athens. But it was successful. H. was the first non-Athenian to accept—under the influence of Aischylos <sup>29</sup>)—the new trial in the *Ἰέπειαι*, which was published shortly after 421 B.C. This fact explains the form of his digression which thus to a degree gives the reasons for the invention, at the same time correcting it. For the historian could not proceed in the same manner as the poet; he could not simply reject other traditions (which were attested more abundantly and by writers older than Aischylos) as the tragic poet ventured to do, not being alone in acting thus nor doing it only in this instance. H. had to make the compromise which appended the new trial to the three earlier ones. The compromise retains the traditional age of the institution, but does not yield up the new title to glory. On the contrary, he found a new aspect not known to Aischylos <sup>30</sup>). He introduced the Spartan accusers <sup>31</sup>), thus creating another distinction for Athens: to her court the Spartans also had applied for justice in previous times. We shall not regard this as being accidental, if we call to mind that the *Ἰέπειαι* was published shortly after the peace of Nikias, and the *Atthis* shortly after the defeat of Athens <sup>32</sup>). These coincidences corroborate what I believe to have established about the political attitude of H. <sup>33</sup>). The *Atthides* seem to have accepted this innovation of H. too <sup>34</sup>).

(2) Marm. Par. A 10 [ἀφ' οὗ Ἐριχ]θόνιος Παναθηναίους τοῖς πρώτοις γενομένοις ἄρμα ἐξευξε καὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα ἐδείκνυε καὶ Ἀθηναίους [ὠν]δμ[ασε]; Philochoros 328 F 8-9. The Atthidographers agree in connecting the Panathenaia with Erichthonios. Earlier tradition is lacking; Herodotos,

who incidentally mentions the festival in his account of the Peisistratids<sup>1</sup>), had no reason for going into its previous history. Neither the silence of tradition nor the omission of Erichthonios in Herodotos (presumably he did not yet distinguish him from Erechtheus<sup>2</sup>) justifies the idea of Niese<sup>3</sup>) that H. was the first to establish the tradition as a 'typically democratic narrative which at the same time detracted from the glory of the Peisistratids'. As far as we can judge, the datings back of historical institutions to mythical times are a great deal older than the beginning of Attidography. The tradition about the Panathenaia is treated in detail on Istros 334 F 4.

(3) About Phorbas see on Istros 334 F 31. The *Attides* connect Phorbas with Theseus; recent writers usually (but probably wrongly) distinguish an earlier bearer of the name. Since H. calls him the son of Poseidon, we may assume that he means the allegedly earlier one, of whom his Attic authorities may have spoken to him as the hero of the Phorbanteion. In that case F 3 belongs to the war of the *Ἐλευσίνιοι μετ' Εὐμόλπου πρὸς Ἐρεχθέα*. This war is a definite fact to which Thukydidēs simply alludes, and which Andron 10 F 1 (following H.?) narrated in greater detail. The mention of the *γένος τῶν ἱεροφαντῶν* in the second book (F 8) of H.'s *Attis* does not of course tell against the Eleusinian war having been treated in the first book. I do not feel certain to-day that Schol. Eurip. *Phoen.* 854<sup>1</sup>) derives immediately from H. If it contained the list of the eleven pre-Trojan kings, which is doubtful for H.<sup>2</sup>), certain for Andron, that would not make much difference, for Andron used H.; but the hypothesis is uncertain<sup>3</sup>). The actual difficulties of the tradition, which are not all chronological, lie in pre-literary times: the war against Athens was originally waged solely by sons of Poseidon; but the king of Athens also is nothing but one form of Poseidon. Apparently two elements have to be distinguished: (1) a purely mythical element, the continuation of the dispute between Athena and Poseidon for the possession of the country because Poseidon would not acquiesce in the pronouncement of the king of the country or of the Twelve Gods<sup>4</sup>); (2) an element of which the core is historical, the antagonism between Eleusis (or Megara) and Athens, which was dated in the time of one of the two primary kings<sup>5</sup>). If, according to Attidographic tradition, Kekrops was the first king and the founder of the Twelve Towns, one of which was Eleusis<sup>6</sup>), only Erechtheus remains for the war; he always was a fixed figure as the master of the citadel and king of Attica. Consequently, when the tradition was made historical and uniform, the dispute

between Athena and Poseidon was superseded by the fight between Eleusis and Athens or, as one might say, the persons and the events were distributed over the two contests. There is hardly a doubt that Eumolpos had become a Thracian already in H.'s time <sup>7</sup>); what compromise H. made as to Eumolpos as the founder of the mysteries, we do not know <sup>8</sup>).

(4) Does this quotation derive from the war of Erechtheus in which Eumolpos conducted Thracians against Athens, and was their native country determined geographically? The Amazon war seems to be less likely, for according to H. the Amazons came from the Phasis or the Thermodon <sup>1</sup>). It is true that we do not learn anything about the way they took, either from H. or from Kleidemos <sup>2</sup>) or from the orators <sup>3</sup>). But since they crossed the Cimmerian Bosphorus when it was frozen they did at any rate not come by ship <sup>4</sup>); therefore they must have travelled through Thrace as Diodoros 4, 28, 2 states <sup>5</sup>).

<sup>15</sup> (5) *Lex. rhel.* p. 279, 23 Bkr (Phot. *Lex. s.v.*; Et. M. p. 589, 48) τόπος ἐστὶ τοῦ Πειραιῶς, ἀπὸ Μουνυχίας Ἀρτέμιδος <sup>1</sup>), ἥτις οὕτως ὠνομάσθη <sup>2</sup>) ἀπὸ Μουνύχου τοῦ Παντακλέους. *Suda s.v.* Ἐμβαρὸς εἰμι· νουνεχής, φρόνιμος. ἦν πρότερον ὁ Πειραιεὺς νῆσος, ὅθεν καὶ τοῦνομα εἴληφεν ἀπὸ τοῦ διαπερᾶν· οὗ τὰ ἄρκα Μούνυχος κατασχὼν Μουνυχίας Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν ἰδρύσατο <sup>3</sup>). *Eustath. II.* p. 331, 26 ὁ αὐτὸς Πausanίας (*Atticista F 163 Schw*; cf. *Zenob. Prov.* p. 350 Mi; *Arphend. Prov.* 2, 54; *Suda s.v.*) ἱστορεῖ καὶ τινα Ἐμβαρὸν ἐπὶ εὐχῆι σοφίσασθαι· ἰδρύσατο γὰρ (φησί) Μουνυχίας Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν <sup>4</sup>). ἄρκτου δὲ γενομένης ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ὑπ' Ἀθηναίων ἀναιρεθείσης, λοιμὸς <sup>5</sup>) ἐπεγένετο, οὗ ἀπαλλαγὴν ὁ θεὸς ἐχρησμάειδεν, <sup>25</sup> εἴ τις τὴν θυγατέρα θύσει τῆι Ἀρτέμιδι. Βάρος δὲ ἤ Ἐμβαρὸς ὑποσχόμενος οὕτω ποιήσειν ἐπὶ τῷ τὴν ἱερωσύνην τὸ γένος αὐτοῦ διὰ βίου ἔχειν, διακοσμήσας τὴν θυγατέρα αὐτὴν μὲν ἀπέκρυψεν ἐν τῷ ἀδύτῳ, αἶλα <sup>6</sup>) δὲ ἐσθῆτι κοσμήσας ὡς τὴν θυγατέρα ἔθυσεν· ὅθεν εἰς παροιμίαν (φησί) περιέστη Ἐμβαρὸς εἶ', τοῦτέστι νουνεχής, φρόνιμος <sup>7</sup>). There is no doubt that <sup>30</sup> 'the hill was always called Munychia; later on the name was applied to the stronghold on the top, and the harbour; it was also used of the quarter of the town, although Munychia did not become an independent deme in Kleisthenes' constitution' <sup>8</sup>). There is no doubt either that Artemis Munychia was named after the hill, and that the eponym Munychos <sup>35</sup> was invented in the same manner as Kolainos in F 13. That this Munychos is an Attic king (which does not necessarily mean the same as 'king of Athens' <sup>9</sup>) is proved by his supplying the date <sup>10</sup>) in the story which Diodoros (of course the periegetes 372 F 34) took from H., and by the statement that the grateful refugees from Orchomenos named the

locality πρὸς τιμὴν τοῦ βασιλέως. We know no particulars as to the time and the person of Munychos; the name, like that of Phorbas in F 3, was also used in the Theseus story <sup>11)</sup> without consideration of chronology, but that does not justify, either in this case or in the former, a division of the figure. The tradition, however, falls into two groups, *viz.* (1) the aition for the custom of the cult <sup>12)</sup>; (2) the aition for the name of the place. H. is cited for the latter only; he is working with the two facts of a Thracian war against Orchomenos on the one hand, and the dispersal of the Minyans over the Greek world on the other. Whether the resulting story is H.'s own combination or Attic local tradition, we cannot decide; but the former alternative may be more likely <sup>13)</sup>. As H. told the story in his second book <sup>14)</sup> we shall have to assume a retrospective digression; such digressions often occurred in the *Atthides* (but not only in them) with names of places in particular (but not only with those) <sup>15)</sup>. If this assumption is correct the most probable point of departure is the fortification of the Munichia by Hippias and the overthrow of the Peisistratids <sup>16)</sup>: *ἔπει δὲ τετάρτῳ μάλιστα μετὰ τὸν Ἰππάρχου θάνατον, ἐπεὶ κακῶς εἶχεν τὰ ἐν τῷ ἄστει, τὴν Μουνυχίαν ἐπεχείρησε τεχνίζειν, ὡς ἐκεῖ μεθιδρυσάμενος· ἐν τούτῳ δ' ὧν ἐξέπεσεν ὑπὸ Κλεομένους.* This addition of Aristotle (*Ἀθπ.* 19, 2) to the report of Herodotos comes from an *Atthis* <sup>17)</sup>. It is a matter of course that H. gave an account of the tyranny <sup>18)</sup>, possibly in his fashion *i.e.* by entering detached notes of greater or lesser fullness.

(6) Here there can really be no doubt <sup>1)</sup> that H. gave the parentage of Hippothoon *because* he was the eponym of one of the Kleisthenian phylai, nor that he enumerated the ten phylai giving a brief explanation of their names. We expect this list in the *Atthides* at the place corresponding to *Aristot. Ἀθπ.* 21, 6 who contents himself with the succinct remark *ταῖς δὲ φυλαῖς ἐποίησεν ἐπωνύμους ἐκ τῶν προκριθέντων ἑκατὸν ἀρχηγῶν οὓς ἀνεῖλεν ἢ Πυθία δέκα.* It is uncertain however <sup>2)</sup> whether we should be justified in expecting anything about the sense of the reform corresponding to the argumentations of Aristotle in ch. 21, 2-4. Perhaps it is more likely that H. confined himself to the facts as given also by Aristotle and Herodotos <sup>3)</sup>, and that his account was not much more detailed than that of the latter. Thirty lines, the space which Aristotle gives to the reform, may have been sufficient for H.'s representation too. Perhaps he supplied the number of the demes: Herodotos may have done the same <sup>4)</sup>, Aristotle did not. If H. did he gave the number of his own time; there would have been no room <sup>5)</sup> for a list of all demes with the necessary explanations, and H. is never quoted for a deme. It is different with regard to the heroes



of the phylai, they are more important since the reform was founded on the new phylai <sup>6</sup>). Surely also H. saw the statues of the eponyms wherever it was that they stood <sup>7</sup>). What he reported about these heroes was the Athenian tradition; he obtained it from the *λόγιοι ἄνδρες*, and it must have existed at the time of Kleisthenes. In these matters H. certainly did not invent anything <sup>8</sup>), nor did he enlarge tradition from more recent special sources, for instance from Euripides' *Alope*; for it is quite unlikely that he told the story of Hippothoon in detail <sup>9</sup>): what was done for Hippothoon must in fairness have been done for the remaining eponyms, and this would have necessitated a number of detailed digressions which would have split up the account. We can perhaps form an idea of the brief enumeration given in his succinct record of the reform from Pausan. I, 5, 1 ff. <sup>10</sup>). At any rate we are able to state that there was a report, relatively detailed for so short an *Atthis*. That is understandable if for H. the constitution of Kleisthenes was the constitution of contemporary Athens (*ἡ νῦν κατάστασις τῆς πολιτείας* as Aristotle expresses it) <sup>11</sup>), and if this assumption is correct it would explain at the same time why Solon does not occur in the fragments: H. knew no particulars and no details about him. In this respect he is in full accord with Herodotos; altogether the living memory of Kleisthenes in the fifth century was much stronger than is generally supposed. For Herodotos Solon apparently is the representative of Athens among the Seven Wise Men of Greece <sup>12</sup>); he may have heard in Athens some external facts about the life of the legislator <sup>13</sup>), and he knows a law which Solon, according to his view, took over from the Egyptians <sup>14</sup>). That Solon had given laws in conformity with which people were living was of course not forgotten in Athens, but there was no talk of a Solonian *πολιτεία* until the opposition introduced the slogan of the *πάτριος πολιτεία* in the closing years of the fifth century. For Aristotle democracy begins with Solon <sup>15</sup>).

It is different with Herodotos, for whom the creator of democracy obviously is Kleisthenes who in the warfare of the parties (*sit venia verbo*) after the overthrow of the Peisistratids τὸν Ἀθηναίων δῆμον πρότερον ἀπωσμένον τότε πάντως πρὸς τὴν ἑωυτοῦ μοῖραν προσεθήκατο, thus being able to carry into effect the reform of the constitution by changing the original four phylai into the ten new ones <sup>16</sup>). This is what one may call the 'Alcmeonid' conception; Herodotos presumably heard it in the circle of Perikles. We have no reason for expecting another conception in H.; from the evidence to be found in the fragments one might even infer a *terminus post* for the catchword *πάτριος πολιτεία*, though such a

suggestion must be made cautiously <sup>17</sup>). The evidence of fourth century Attidography confirms, as far as it goes, the main assumption: of course, all *Atthides* provide the facts of the reform of Kleisthenes <sup>18</sup>); but at least Androtion and Philochoros treated the legislation and constitution of Solon in detail <sup>19</sup>), and Aristotle, who knew several *Atthides* and the pamphlet literature besides, found the figure of Solon so essential that he wrote, largely on the basis of the poems, a regular biography of the creator of democracy. The fight about the constitution becomes (or is accompanied by) a fight about Solon. The conception of him has numerous nuances, for at first the conservatives claim Solon for themselves in the fight against the democracy of Kleisthenes <sup>20</sup>), and the democrats answer the claim either by siding with Kleisthenes and making out Solon a conservative <sup>21</sup>) or by trying to blacken Solon's memory <sup>22</sup>), or they accept Solon as the founder of democracy but make him an extreme democrat. For democrats is what all want to be called in the fourth century, since the undisguised policy of hatred for democracy pursued by the right-radical hetairiai under the Thirty had suffered an ignominious bankruptcy. We cannot investigate here in detail the transformations undergone by the picture of Solon (nor is our material sufficient for doing so), but the outcome is evident: during the fourth century the conservative conception carries the day in so far as, largely in accordance with historical facts, Solon becomes the creator of democracy (whatever that is understood to be), and he supersedes the personality of Kleisthenes more and more. There is a typical difference between the amendment of Kleitophon in 413/2 B.C. with the reasons given for it <sup>23</sup>) and the final judgment of Aristotle that Solon was the creator of democracy, but by the reforms of Kleisthenes δημοτικωτέρα πολὺ τῆς Σόλωνος ἐγένετο ἡ πολιτεία <sup>24</sup>). It is hardly conceivable that H. had no feeling as to the contemporary fight about the constitution; but we can understand that he was not yet affected by the dispute about the picture of Solon and he may have judged the movement of 411 B.C. approximately in the same manner as Kleitophon, viz. as an attempt at a reform of the democracy of Kleisthenes which had been radicalized by Ephialtes and Perikles.

(7) A perfectly certain reference of the fragment is impossible. Those who keep to the four books of the *Atthis* will have to assume that the important harbour on the gulf of Corinth was mentioned in the Pentekontaetia or/and in the history of the Peloponnesian War: H. cannot have been so 'succinct' as to pass over the adhesion of Megara to the Athenian Federation <sup>1</sup>) in 462/1 B.C. <sup>2</sup>). In fact he is apt to give events of war

rather in detail <sup>5</sup>), and he doubtless obtained an archonship's date in Athens for the treaty. We should expect notes from H. also about the attacks on Megara in which Pagai, being the residence of the Megarian φυγάδες <sup>4</sup>), played a rather important part. Those who are convinced of the corruption of the number in Harpokration <sup>5</sup>), may hesitate between the two possible alterations of  $\bar{\Lambda}$  for  $\Delta$ , and δευτέρωι for  $\delta$ . The former is palaeographically a little more easy; but the *Atthis* cannot have recorded in detail the war of the Epigonoι <sup>6</sup>), supposing it mentioned it at all; again the Megarian tradition of the residence of Tereus at Pagai <sup>7</sup>) would hardly be expected in the *Atthis*. The corruption of δευτέρωι to  $\delta$  is so frequent that I do not hesitate to place F 7 among the fragments of the second book and to assign it to the first Peloponnesian War.

(8) The fragment probably means to say that H. concerned himself about the family from which the hierophants were chosen. Whether he <sup>15</sup> spoke of this as a regular part of his theme when treating the mysteries, the establishment of which we should expect in the first book <sup>1</sup>), or *data occasione* (and in that case, on what occasion?) <sup>2</sup>) cannot be said. As far as we can see H. merely recorded the external facts of the cults; their religious side was not treated so much in the *Atthis* as in the special <sup>20</sup> books about these matters, e.g. Melanthios Περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἐλευσίνι μυστηρίων; Philochoros Περὶ μυστηρίων τῶν Ἀθηνῶν. Certainly a digression of some extent about the Eleusinian families would not be impossible in the second book, but there is hardly a connexion with F 24.

(9) *Lex. rhet.* p. 301, 19 Bkr Στεφανηφόρος ἥρωος· ἦτοι ὅτι οὕτω καλεῖται <sup>25</sup> ὁ ἥρωος ἢ ἐξ ἐπωνυμίας, διότι περὶ αὐτὸν εἶχε πολλοὺς στεφάνους ἢ ὅτι πλησίον αὐτοῦ οἱ στέφανοι ἐπιπράσχοντο. Hesych. s.v. στεφανοφόροντα· ἀπ' οἴκου τινὸς καλουμένου Στεφανηφόρου. Conjectures about the hero are collected in Kreuzer-Hoefler *Rosch. Lex.* IV col. 1426 f., and by Gerhard *RE* III A col. 2347 f. Recently the opinion of Boeckh <sup>1</sup>) has been widely <sup>30</sup> approved and variously developed. Boeckh connects the hero with the Athenian mint because of the δραχμαὶ Στεφανηφόρου. But the combinations of Beulé <sup>2</sup>) and Seltman <sup>3</sup>) are quite insufficiently supported. The pre-Persian torso of Sunion, 'a youth placing a crown upon his head' is an ephebe, not a hero; an ἀναδούμενος, not a στεφανηφόρος. The <sup>35</sup> coins are of a considerably later time; M. N. Tod *J H St* 54, 1934, p. 155 thinks it 'probable that the term στεφανηφόροι was used popularly as a cant-name for the Athenian tetradrachms and drachmas of the "New Style" <sup>4</sup>), first issued in 230/20 B.C., which have a wreath round the reverse type, whereas there was no such wreath on the coins of the "Old

Style"'. In order to explain the fragment we shall have to put aside all these conjectures. H. may have given the legend of the establishment as he did for the Phorbanteion <sup>6)</sup>. But the fact that the fragment is quoted from the second book seems to indicate a retrospective remark <sup>6)</sup> or a simple statement about a place: Phya, who brought Peisistratos back, was according to *ἔνιοι* (surely Atthidographers) <sup>7)</sup> *α στεφανόπωλις Θραϊττα*. The suggestion that F 9 belongs to the history of Peisistratos is perhaps corroborated by the passage in the *Lexeis* *ὅτι πλησίον αὐτοῦ οἱ στέφανοι ἐπιπράσκοντο* <sup>8)</sup>, and it accords with the fundamentally democratic attitude of H.s *Atthis* <sup>9)</sup>. But this is nothing but a suggestion.

(10) It is not all certain that H. began his Attic history at the very beginning with the legendary king Ogygos <sup>1)</sup>. The collective quotation in F 10, which passed through many hands, is treated fully in the commentary on Philochoros 328 F 92. It ultimately derives from Alexander Polyhistor who, following the Jewish and oriental chronography of Hellenism, syncretized the Greek and the oriental traditions. In these constructions the floods were counted and the first was placed under the name of Ogygos. We must not claim either for H. or for Philochoros, the first Atthidographer and the last, the data which Africanus used, *viz.* the intervals between Ogygos and the first Olympiad (1020 years), between Ogygos and Kekrops (189 years), the flood of Ogygos, and the figure of this king <sup>2)</sup>. The criticism of Philochoros does not apply to H. whose history of Attica began with king Kekrops. The evidence of the fragments confirms this; for 'pre-Kekropian' kings (if they really are such) do not appear in them except as eponyms in retrospective digressions <sup>3)</sup>.

(11) The fragment follows F 23 in which Neleus is called *τῆς δωδεκαπόλεως Ἰωνίας κτίστης*; that determines his position in the king list and his date <sup>1)</sup>. The claim of Athens to be the metropolis of the Ionian Twelve Towns, or at least of some of them, may be earlier; but it certainly was not until the foundation of the Delian league in 478/7 B.C. that it became consolidated and more widely acknowledged in Ionia itself as well as elsewhere <sup>2)</sup>. The form in which the claim appears in H. is late, and, I now feel sure, his own invention <sup>3)</sup>. According to Herodotos, who pleads the Athenian claim in the most comprehensive form, *viz.* that all Ionians, not only the Twelve Towns, had started from Athens <sup>4)</sup>, Neleus is the founder of Miletos only <sup>5)</sup>. Pherekydes says about Androklos, a (or the?) *υἱὸς γνήσιος Κόδρου τοῦ Ἀθηνῶν βασιλέως*, that he conducted (or began?) the *Ἰώνων ἀποικία* and founded Ephesos <sup>6)</sup>; Euripides is able to speak of Ion as *κτίστωρ Ἀσιάδος χθονός* <sup>7)</sup>. This discrepancy clearly

shows that the tradition is not 'founded on the leading position of Miletos in the Ionian world' <sup>8</sup>), and that it did not even start from that town. It did not exist until H. composed it of two elements: (1) Neleus was assumed to be the founder of Miletos <sup>9</sup>); (2) Neleus had a cult in Athens <sup>10</sup>).

5 The fusion of the two items became self-evident and for the mind of H., tending as it did towards unifying and dating the dispersed traditions, the conception of the Ionian migration as a single movement with Miletos as its aim and as its first foundation became a given fact <sup>11</sup>). This conception puts the claim of Athens in the most pointed form, but it by no means

10 corresponds to the situation as it was in the fifth century: the position of Miletos had been shaken most gravely by the Ionian revolt, and Ephesos, which had been lukewarm during the revolt and had almost adhered to the Persians, derived advantage from the situation <sup>12</sup>). On the other hand Pherekydes, who wrote earlier and before the foundation

15 of the Delian league <sup>13</sup>), may have had in view the conditions of his own time when assigning to Ephesos a (the?) genuine son of Kodros as its founder <sup>14</sup>). It is possible that the construction of H. was partly determined by the necessity of establishing the list of post-Trojan kings: for doing this he had at his disposal the Attic traditions about Demophon

20 and the Theseids on the one hand, the Neleids and the transference of the kingdom to the Melanthids on the other <sup>15</sup>). Herodotos knew already that Kodros, Melanthos, and Neleus belonged together as being Πύλοιοι τε καὶ Νηλεΐδαι <sup>16</sup>). It would lead us too far afield to treat here Medon, the ancestor of an alleged Athenian clan, and his connexion with Ko-

25 dros <sup>17</sup>). In F 23 H. accentuates the fact that Kodros died καταλιπὼν τὴν ἀρχὴν Μέδοντι τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ τῶν παίδων, and he calls Neleus νεώτερος αὐτοῦ παῖς <sup>18</sup>). Whether he narrated particulars about the conditions of the emigration cannot be said: the Plato scholiast of F 23, who was solely concerned with Kodros, did not continue his excerpt, and we must

30 not simply derive later accounts from H. <sup>19</sup>). It is even more regrettable that we do not know whether H. inserted here one of the longer digressions which were hardly lacking in the first book, treating in it the special traditions of the several towns, the participation of other tribes and fractions of peoples, and the relations of the individual κτίσται to Kodros

35 or Neleus. Hesych. s.v. Καδμεῖοι· οἱ Πριηνεῖς, ὡς Ἑλλάνικος <sup>20</sup>) proves H. to have been acquainted, perhaps even more widely than Herodotos, with the old special traditions, which knew nothing of Athens, occurred in the elegiac poets, and—some of them—even appeared in literature in fifth century prose writers <sup>21</sup>). These traditions were introduced into

the local chronicles, and it was the less possible to suppress them because the break-down of the Empire naturally did not favour universal acceptance of the Athenian version, although this had now become uniform<sup>23</sup>). But it is uncertain from what book the above fragment about Priene is taken: in H.s genealogical works many of the Ionian connexions must have been mentioned, and the *Ἱερείαι* certainly treated the Ionian migration in the same way as the migrations to Italy, or even in greater detail. It therefore appears possible that in the *Atthis* H. contented himself with presenting the simple facts of his construction, and that he then continued his account as succinctly (but sufficiently for Athens) as he does in F 23. But one does expect him to enumerate the Twelve Towns, and F 11 proves that he did. He must also have mentioned the Panionia, for the festival was a historical fact connected with the migration<sup>23</sup>). H.s conception, which was solely concerned with the claim of Athens, seems to have penetrated Atthidography in the same way as many other ideas which H. had created or had been the first to formulate<sup>24</sup>).

(12) See on T 8.

(13) Cf. Pausan. I, 31, 5; Hesych., Suda s.v. *Κολαινίς*; Theognost. Cram. A. O. II p. 66, 30. All start from the discussion about the verses of the comic poet who mentions the Kolainis worshipped in Myrrhinus and in the town<sup>1</sup>). Both explanations of the cult-name are treated on Phanodemos 325 F 3. The grammarian Euphronios, teacher of Aristophanes of Byzantium<sup>2</sup>), wrongly<sup>3</sup>) used the sacrificing of *κόλα* or *κολοβά* (which was allowed in the cult of Artemis Amargynthia) for explaining the epithet of Artemis Kolainis of Myrrhinus. He caused confusion by this mistake, though rather among modern writers than among the ancients, for the scholiast (Didymos?) simply rejects the wild etymology, citing H. and Phanodemos for the legend about the establishment of the cult of Artemis Kolainis<sup>4</sup>). H. may have mentioned her in one of his retrospective remarks which were rather frequent in his work<sup>5</sup>); Phanodemos may, according to his fashion, have recorded particulars (not very valuable ones) about the pre-Kekropian king who is not known otherwise<sup>6</sup>). Unfortunately we cannot tell on what occasion H. made his remark, as we are not even given the number of the book. It is possible that he had a political purpose, intending to derive the Messenian town Kolonides from Athens; but such an aim would perhaps be more likely in the time of Epameinondas (or later) than in the fifth century<sup>7</sup>).

(14-19) The considerable remains of the Theseus story are very illuminating as to the literary character of the *Atthis*, which in its first, mainly narrative, book must have been very similar to the *Τρωικά* <sup>1</sup>). On the one hand H. evidently follows the Athenian tradition about the national hero, which had received its first shaping in the *Theseis* of the last quarter of the sixth century <sup>2</sup>). It had been introduced into historiography by Pherekydes <sup>3</sup>) who perhaps closely followed the epic; since then it had undergone a steady further development in Tragic Poetry. On the other hand the modernization or rationalization of the tradition is equally manifest. The latter seems to have been general and penetrative <sup>4</sup>); the former involves a pro-Athenian tendency <sup>5</sup>), but it steers clear of the excesses of apologetics <sup>6</sup>). We cannot ascertain any particulars about the sources, for the record of the War of the Seven against Thebes is lacking in the fragments <sup>7</sup>). It was, of course, not H. who elevated Theseus to the rank of a national hero <sup>8</sup>), and—in view of the considerable remains of a Theseus story in Pherekydes—one cannot even confidently maintain that it was H. who ‘established a definite Attic tradition of his life’, or (as one had better formulate) a definite historic tradition <sup>9</sup>). Unluckily our knowledge of H.’s narrative too is by no means complete because Plutarch’s quotations from him almost exclusively refer to the middle period of Theseus’ life and to what might be called foreign policy of that time according to the conceptions of H. From Theseus’ youth we have only the Cretan adventure, which according to general tradition belongs to the closing years of Aigeus’ reign, according to H. possibly to its first part <sup>10</sup>). F 15 leaves it uncertain whether H. treated the purging of the Isthmian narrows from monsters in detail at all, for F 6 is taken from the second book and does not belong in this context. It is, in fact, not impossible for H. to have despatched these exploits quite briefly, if he did not omit them altogether: the literary dispute with Megara, in which they play an important rôle, belongs to the fourth century. From the time of the reign of Theseus we have the establishment of the Isthmia and the state-treaty with Corinth in F 15, the expedition to the country of the Amazons and the repulse of their campaign of vengeance in F 16-17. Subsequently the last period opens with the rape of Helen, which led to the first war of the Peloponnesians with Athens, and the ‘expedition to Hades’ in F 18/9, entirely rationalized in the style of Hekataios. It is extremely regrettable that in the last part of the *Vita*, as in the history of Theseus’ youth, quotations from H. are lacking; we cannot trace immediately back to

the first *Atthis* either the whole account in ch. 32-36, or single facts; Philochoros decidedly has a stronger claim <sup>11</sup>). F 20/1 prove H. to have recorded the overthrow of Theseus and the transference of the government to Menestheus. It is merely an inference (although probable in my opinion) that Philochoros' account was not substantially different from that of the first *Atthidographer*, and we may confidently believe H. capable of modernizing the incidents of which the tradition had been created not so very long before <sup>12</sup>). What we cannot find out is whether, and if so how far, his mainly democratic attitude influenced his record <sup>13</sup>). I believe that we have to be very cautious in assuming reflections into the past: that is a very different matter from the modernization of traditional incidents which is obvious at every turn. *A priori* I should not expect in H. anything corresponding to Euripides' notions <sup>14</sup>); and Plutarch (*Thes.* 25, 3) when dealing with the conception of Theseus as the king who πρώτος ἀπέκλινε πρὸς τὸν ὄχλον καὶ ἀφῆκε τὸ μοναρχεῖν quotes Aristotle, not H. <sup>15</sup>). In view of the quotation from H. in ch. 25, 7 (= F 15) that is sufficient proof (even if a negative one) that H. did not share that opinion. The impression we get from the fragments (perhaps from F 15 in particular) is in accord with the ideas of Thukydides who, purposely omitting the question of Menestheus which is of no importance for him, finds in Theseus the creator of Athens as a metropolis and consequently as powerful outside the bounds of Greece <sup>16</sup>). We cannot doubt that H. also recorded the synoecism which in itself is on the border of home and foreign policy, and we can only regret that we do not know in what form and from what point of view he recorded it <sup>17</sup>).

(14) Plutarch merely inserts a peculiar trait from H. as a variant into his account which otherwise follows the general tradition <sup>1</sup>), and owing to this he seems to be involuntarily misleading. General tradition makes Theseus not accompany the hostages until the third δασμός <sup>2</sup>). That may be an original feature of the old story, even if the idea that the hero ἐπέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ἄνευ κλήρου προσελθόντων belongs to the later details in the picture of Theseus' friendliness to the people <sup>3</sup>). Plutarch seems to have assumed that H. followed the general tradition in the matter of the third δασμός <sup>4</sup>); we also find in Diodoros, who follows an average mythological handbook, the grotesque idea that διελοθόντων δὲ ἐτῶν ἐννέα πάλιν ὁ Μίνως ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν Ἀττικὴν μετὰ μεγάλου στόλου, καὶ τοὺς δις ἐπτά κόρους ἀπαιτήσας ἔλαβε <sup>5</sup>). Actually the contents of the quotation from H. leave no doubt that it derives from the description of the war: the treaty which puts an end to that obliges the Athenians



(among other regulations?) to furnish hostages, and in that case it is self-evident that Minos picks out the hostages, and also self-evident for him to take the son of the king in the first place <sup>6</sup>). This legally accurate form finds a parallel in the treaty of the state of Athens with Corinth in F 15, and an even better one in the treaty which the Greeks concluded with Aineias after the capture of Troy <sup>7</sup>). We are perfectly justified in picturing the account of the war of Minos with Athens according to the narrative of the Trojan War in the second book of the *Τρωικά*. But as the treaty contains the regulation ἀπολομένου δὲ τοῦ Μινωταύρου <sup>10</sup> πέρας ἔχειν τὴν ποινήν we must assume that H. still took him for the fabulous monster. The rationalisation was (conceivably enough) not so fully carried into effect as it was in the tale of the expedition to Hades F 18 and in the descriptions of the fourth century Attidographers we know, for whom the divergence between the account of Minos in <sup>15</sup> Homer on the one hand and in Tragedy on the other also became a problem <sup>8</sup>). If our assumption proves true it is not accidental that H.s name does not appear in the compilation of ch. 19: he gave his account according to what οἱ πολλοὶ γράφουσι καὶ αἰδοῦσι <sup>9</sup>). Theseus killed the monster with the help of Ariadne <sup>10</sup>) and escaped on the ship which according <sup>20</sup> to the treaty the Athenians had had to furnish for the hostages. Ariadne's fate remains vague in H.s account <sup>11</sup>), and it is extremely doubtful whether he had the story of the black sail which caused the death of Aigeus <sup>12</sup>).

(15) Marm. Par. A 20 (first year of Theseus) ἀφ' οὗ Θησεὺς . . . <sup>25</sup> τὰς δώδεκα πόλεις εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ συνώκισεν καὶ πολιτείας καὶ τὴν δημοκρατίαν παρέδωκε \* \* \* ος Ἀθηῶν τὸν τῶν Ἴσθμίων ἀγῶνα ἔθηκε Σίνιν ἀποκτείνας. Hypoth. Pindar. *Isthm.* (b) p. 192, 16 Dg. τὸν τῶν Ἴσθμίων ἀγῶνα οἱ μὲν ἐπὶ Σίνιδι τῷ Προκρούστη <sup>1</sup>) διαθεῖναι φασὶ τὸν Θησεῖα ἀνελόντα αὐτόν . . . <sup>2</sup>), οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ Μελικέρτη κτλ. *Ibid.* p. 194, 20 τὰ Ἴσθμια <sup>30</sup> ἄγεται τῷ Μελικέρτη . . . ἐσιωπήθη δὲ πρὸς χρόνον διὰ τοὺς ληιστάς· Θησεὺς δὲ ἐλθὼν ἐκάθηρε τοὺς τόπους καὶ ἤγε δεύτερον. Plin. *N. H.* 5, 205 *ludos . . . funebres . . . . Theseus in Isthmo, Hercules Olympiae*. Hygin. *fab.* 273, 8 *decimo Isthmia Melicertae . . . {ecisse dicitur Eratocles(?)}, alii poetae dicunt Theseum*. What H. gave is evident <sup>3</sup>): after the interruption by the variants, the words ἔταξεν οὖν resume the narrative τὸν ἀγῶνα ἔθηκε κατὰ ζῆλον Ἡρακλέους, and the state-treaty is established as belonging to H. by the parallels <sup>4</sup>). It is regrettable that the variants are cited anonymously; but as to H., both because of the reason given (κατὰ ζῆλον Ἡρακλέους) and because of the form of the treaty it appears

impossible that he connected the adventures of Theseus' youth (if he narrated them at all <sup>6</sup>) with the establishment of the Isthmia: that is why Plutarch sets the variants over against the opinion of H. If they are earlier, H. introduced a new motif, which throws a bright light on his general conception of Theseus <sup>7</sup>): he presumably carried consistently into effect the tendency <sup>7</sup>) (which existed implicitly and explicitly during the fifth century) to make Theseus the Attic counterpart of Herakles <sup>8</sup>), who was Dorian at least in a political sense. The several versions presumably all started from the prohedria of Athens at the Corinthian games, and gave mythic reasons in the usual manner. Certainly the Corinthians acknowledged neither the establishment by Theseus nor the reasons given. But the prohedria must have been an established fact <sup>9</sup>), and in view of Thuk. 8, 10, 1 <sup>10</sup>) one will not believe the Corinthians to have disputed the honorary privilege of Athens for instance after the break of 462/1 or after 431 B.C. The situation is not such that H., pro-Athenian as he was, had to defend disputed claims of Athens, as Tragedy occasionally did.

(16-17) For Theseus' expedition to the Pontos see on Philochoros F 110. The passage of Tzetzes, who gives more citations from H.s Amazon story, is perhaps more likely to belong here than in the Phoronis <sup>1</sup>). Of course, Tzetzes did not study H.s own writings; the quotation is traditional, but it may very well be H. who re-shaped the earlier mythic notion by making use of the knowledge Ionic *ιστορη* had acquired: Hippokr. Π. ἀερ. 17 (about the women of the Sauromatai) <sup>25</sup> τὸν δεξιὸν δὲ μαζὸν οὐκ ἔχουσι· παιδίοις γὰρ ἐοῦσιν νηπίοις αἱ μητέρες χαλκίον τετεχνημένον ἐπ' αὐτῶι τούτῳ διάπυρον ποίεουσαι πρὸς τὸν μαζὸν τιθέασι τὸν δεξιόν, καὶ ἐπὶ καίεται. In F 17 only the special feature that the Amazons crossed the frozen Bosporos belongs to H. <sup>2</sup>); I have no doubt that he invented it following Herodt. 4, 28 <sup>3</sup>). Everything else <sup>30</sup> belongs to Kleidemos <sup>4</sup>). About their further route through Thrace see on F 4. In regard to H.s geographical views we learn from this fragment that he made the Amazons reside on the Thermodon and that, like Hekataios <sup>5</sup>), he took the Cimmeric Bosporos to be the frontier between Asia and Europe. Was he aware of the possibility to make the expedition of Theseus and the Amazons' campaign of vengeance correspond <sup>35</sup> to the Athenian ships sent to the assistance of the Ionian revolt and the subsequent expedition of Xerxes? In any case it is significant that he reflected upon the route followed by the Amazons from Themiskyra to Athens.

(18-19) H. is directly quoted only for the statements concerning the ages of Theseus and Helen which we will not examine as to their particulars <sup>1)</sup>. They are important because they throw some light on the carrying through of mythical chronology: there can be no doubt that H. in the first book of the *Attis* dated not only by kings but by kings' years as well, as he did in the *Ἱέρεια* by years of priestesses. Since Plutarch after the statement from H. adds anonymously the variants given by apologists for Theseus <sup>2)</sup> we are fully justified in taking the *πλείστοι μάρτυρες* to include, or even to mean primarily, H.: after the digression the main account continues as in ch. 25, 2-7, where no doubt the treaty with Corinth derives from H. <sup>3)</sup>. Whether it does so directly, or through an Atthidographer who used H., cannot be decided with full certainty, and after all this is of no great importance. In ch. 25 H. seems to have reached Plutarch through Andron, in this passage perhaps through Philochoros, for the continuation of the 'Hades' story, the deliverance of Theseus by Herakles closes with a quotation from Philochoros, who may have recorded this adventure as he did others, mainly following H. <sup>4)</sup>. Here as elsewhere <sup>5)</sup> H. has influenced mythography proper as we read it in the later handbooks <sup>6)</sup>. They show an interesting correction in a detail: the age Helen had reached when Theseus raped her is stated a little higher; Diodoros gives 10, the *Bibliotheca* 12 years <sup>7)</sup>. The reason must be that tradition knew a daughter from this marriage—Iphigeneia. The age and the origin of this tradition can only be stated conjecturally; but certainly it was old <sup>8)</sup>. We have to infer that H. rejected it because it did not agree with his chronology <sup>9)</sup>; it is likely that he did so silently rather than in express words. The narrative which we were able to trace back to H. does indeed state expressly that although Theseus obtained Helen as his wife by lot, he gave her into the charge of his mother οὐπω γάμων ὄραν ἔχουσαν <sup>10)</sup> and himself went to Epirus with Peirithoos; the progress of the narrative precludes the consummation of the marriage <sup>11)</sup>. What H. gives is the Attic tradition of his time, which Herodotos also knew, even with variants as to the details. This tradition is old, in fact it is among the oldest portions of the Theseus myth <sup>12)</sup>. As far as it concerned the rape of Helen it needed but slight modernisations; but the story of Theseus' and Peirithoos' descent to Hades when connected with the former had to be rationalized throughout.

(20-21) Plutarch. Theseus 34, 3 Αἴθραν δὲ τὴν Θησέως μητέρα γενομένην ἀλχμάλωτον ἀπαχθῆναι λέγουσι εἰς Λακεδαίμονα κάκειθεν εἰς

- Τροίαν μεθ' Ἑλένης· καὶ μαρτυρεῖν Ὅμηρον (*Il. Γ 144*) ἐπεσθαι τῇ Ἑλένῃ φάμενον «Αἶθρην Πιτθῆος θύγατρα Κλυμένην τε βοῶπιν». οἱ δὲ καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ἔπος διαβάλλουσι καὶ τὴν περὶ Μουνίου<sup>1)</sup> μυθολογίαν, ὃν ἐκ Δημοφῶντος Λαοδίκης κρύφα τεκούσης ἐν Ἰλίῳ συνεχθρέψαι τὴν
- 5 Αἶθραν λέγουσιν. 35, 5-7 ἐπιχειρῶν οὖν (*scil.* Theseus returned from Ereigos) βιάζεσθαι κατεδημαγωγεῖτο καὶ κατεστασιάζετο, καὶ τέλος ἀπογνοὺς τὰ πράγματα τοὺς μὲν παῖδας εἰς Εὐβοίαν ὑπεξέπεμψε πρὸς Ἑλεφνήνορα τὸν Χαλκῶδοντος, αὐτός δὲ . . . εἰς Σκύρον ἐξέπλευσεν (where he dies) . . . καὶ παραυτίκα μὲν οὐδεὶς ἔσχεν αὐτοῦ λόγον οὐδένα
- 10 τεθηκός, ἀλλὰ τῶν μὲν Ἀθηναίων ἐβασίλευσε Μενεσθεύς, οἱ δὲ παῖδες ἰδιωτεύοντες Ἑλεφνήνορι συνεστράτευσαν· ἐκεῖθεν δὲ Μενεσθέως ἀποθανόντος ἐπανελθόντες αὐτοὶ τὴν βασιλείαν ἀνεκομίσαντο. Pausan. I, 17, 5 τότε δὲ ἐχομένου Θησέως στρατεύουσιν ἐς Ἄφιδναν οἱ Τυνδάρεω παῖδες, καὶ τὴν τε Ἄφιδναν αἰροῦσι καὶ Μενεσθέα ἐπὶ βασιλείαι κατήγαγον.
- 15 (6) Μενεσθεύς δὲ τῶν μὲν παίδων τῶν Θησέως παρὰ Ἑλεφνήνορα ὑπεξελθόντων ἐς Εὐβοίαν εἶχεν οὐδένα λόγον, Θησέα δέ, εἴ ποτε παρὰ Θεσπρωτῶν ἀνακομισθήσεται, δυσανταγώνιστον ἡγούμενος, καθίστατο ὡς Θησέα ἀνασώθοντα ὕστερον ἀπωσθῆναι. στέλλεται δὲ Θησεύς παρὰ Δευκαλίωνα ἐς Κρήτην, ἐξενεχθέντα δὲ αὐτὸν ὑπὸ πνευμάτων ἐς Σκύρον<sup>2)</sup> κτλ. Bibl.
- 20 *Epit.* I, 23 καὶ Διόσκουροι μὲν μετὰ Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ Ἀρκάδων εἰλον Ἀθήνας καὶ ἀπάγουσι Ἑλένην καὶ μετὰ ταύτης Αἶθραν τὴν Πιτθέως αἰχμάλωτον, Δημοφῶν δὲ καὶ Ἀκάμας ἐφυγον· κατάγουσι δὲ καὶ Μενεσθέα καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῶν Ἀθηναίων διδώσι τούτοις. (24) . . . Θησέα δὲ Ἡρακλῆς ἀναγαγὼν ἐπέμψεν εἰς Ἀθήνας· ἐκεῖθεν δὲ ὑπὸ Μενεσθέως ἐξελασθεὶς πρὸς
- 25 Λυκομήδην ἦλθεν. 5, 22 ἀπάγουσι δὲ καὶ τὴν Θησέως μητέρα Αἶθραν οἱ Θησέως παῖδες Δημοφῶν καὶ Ἀκάμας· καὶ γὰρ τούτους λέγουσιν εἰς Τροίαν ἔλθειν ὕστερον<sup>3)</sup>. Diod. 4, 63, 4 καὶ Θησέα μὲν ὕστερον διὰ τὴν Ἡρακλέους χάριν ἀπολυθῆναι. . . . ἔνιοι δὲ τῶν μυθογράφων φασὶν ἀμφοτέρους μὴ τυχεῖν τῆς νόστου. (5) καθ' ὃν δὴ χρόνον λέγουσι τοὺς . . . Διοσκούρους στρα-
- 30 τεύσαντας ἐπὶ τὴν Ἄφιδναν . . . τὴν δ' Ἑλένην ἀπαγαγεῖν εἰς Λακεδαίμονα παρθένον οὖσαν καὶ μετ' αὐτῆς δούλην τὴν μητέρα Θησέως Αἶθραν<sup>4)</sup>. Schol. Apoll. Rhod. I, 101/4 . . . ἐπεστράτευσαν δὲ κατὰ τῆς Τροικῆνος οἱ Διόσκουροι διὰ τὴν ἀδελφὴν, Θησέως ὄντος ἐν Ἄϊδου, καὶ πορθήσαντες Ἐλαβὸν αἰχμάλωτον Αἶθραν τὴν Θησέως μητέρα. Schol. Eurip. *Troad.* 31
- 35 ταῦτα ἔνιοι πρὸς χάριν Ἀθηναίων Εὐριπίδην λέγειν. ἀγαπητὸν γὰρ εἶναι τοῖς περὶ Δημοφῶντα Αἶθραν ἀναλαβεῖν, ἧς ἕνεκα αὐτοὺς φασὶν<sup>5)</sup> εἰς Τροίαν ἔλθειν, Μενεσθέως ἀφηγουμένου τῶν Ἀθηναίων.

We cannot decide with certainty whether the two quotations derive from the *Aithis* or from the *Troika*. For F 20 the former, for F 21

the latter provenance may be more likely <sup>6</sup>), but the facts must anyhow have occurred in the *Atthis*, even if more succinctly. Here we come upon two Homeric problems: (1) one of interpretation simply (or, as we should put it, of textual criticism <sup>7</sup>), Γ 144; (2) a historical one, B 546; 556.

5 In Γ 144 the question is whether the two slave women of Helen were persons well known from mythic tradition. If that question actually was an old Homeric problem <sup>8</sup>) it was answered in the affirmative for H. by the *Iliupersis* <sup>9</sup>), by early lyric poetry <sup>10</sup>) and, supposing he took account of this, by art <sup>11</sup>). The *Iliupersis* also offered him as participants

10 in the Trojan War the sons of Theseus, whom the *Iliad* did not know. A real problem arose from the passage in *Il.* B and the use to be made of it for the construction of the Attic king list. The Catalogue of ships definitely yielded the fact, indisputable for H., that at the time of the war Menestheus was king of Athens, however little else Athenian tradition

15 knew about him <sup>12</sup>). But the *Iliad* said nothing about his further fate, and it is uncertain whether the cyclic poems were more informative <sup>13</sup>). Attic tradition, in which connections with the *Τρωικά* are copious but throughout of a secondary nature, provided the kings Theseus and Demophon, the latter in detached stories, for instance in the aition of

20 the Choes <sup>14</sup>) (not a late myth), and that of the homicide court *ἐπι Παλλαδίων* <sup>15</sup>). Whether the story of the *Φυλλίδος ἀραί*, famous during the fifth century, (and hardly much older) was connected with Demophon in particular; whether it brought him back to Athens from Troy, remains doubtful in our tradition <sup>16</sup>). We know even less of the earlier

25 tradition about Akamas who must have been important as early as the sixth century, for one of the Cleisthenian phylai is named from him, although he never became a king <sup>17</sup>). H. who, as far as we know, was the first to establish a post-Trojan king-list, must have combined the data of the epos with the Attic tradition. It seems almost evident that he

30 agreed with Plutarch *Thes.* 32 ff. in the main lines of his record: Menestheus appears as a descendant of Erechtheus <sup>18</sup>), and this may mean that he actually had a better right to the throne than Aigeus and Theseus <sup>19</sup>). He enforced his right with the help of the enemy of the country <sup>20</sup>), or he became one of the usurpers in which the Attic list abounds <sup>21</sup>),

35 composed as it is entirely of single persons. Correspondingly the sons of Theseus—and Theseus himself <sup>22</sup>) when the story of Hades was rationalized—had to be removed from Athens. The sons according to a tolerably uniform tradition were deposited by Theseus in Euboeia, as he had left Helen at Aphidna, the reason being that he was no longer sure of the

attitude of the people <sup>23</sup>). Or, after the re-establishment of Menestheus by the Spartans, the sons fled to Euboia themselves. Tradition since the *Iliupersis* also agrees in this that they set out for Troy from Euboia, either with Elephenor, or later and by themselves <sup>24</sup>) in order to liberate  
 5 their mother <sup>25</sup>). Once they were in Troy they were given other exploits or adventures <sup>26</sup>), and the Phyllis story, not yet known in the *Nostoi*, could easily be placed here in later prose narratives. But the account given by H. of these events cannot be recovered even conjecturally and (which is worse) we cannot determine, either absolutely or relatively,  
 10 his date for the fall of Troy. As to the relative date, *i.e.* the connection with an Attic regnal year, at least a suggestion can be made: two statements compete, (1) the first year of Demophon; (2) the last year of Menestheus, this latter being the fundamental date in all the preserved king-lists. Now, it is uncertain whether in F 21b more belongs to H.  
 15 than the date of the day, and it is next to certain that F 21c does not derive from the *Atthis* but from the 'Ιέπειαι <sup>27</sup>). But whoever made the sons of Theseus go to Troy, as *φυγάδες* and on their own responsibility, so that they were not even sure of a share in the booty, cannot very well have considered the year of the conquest of Troy to be the first  
 20 year of Demophon's reign. In other words, when Troy was captured Menestheus was still the leader of the Athenians and therefore all probability favours the assumption that the fundamental date of the *Atthis* which equated the fall of Troy with the last year of Menestheus was that of H. <sup>28</sup>). It is the gravest gap in our knowledge that owing to our  
 25 ignorance about H.s pre-Trojan list <sup>29</sup>) we cannot convert this relative date into an absolute one <sup>30</sup>). For the fall of Troy certainly was the cardinal point of the entire mythic chronology of H., who hardly used the Olympiads for this purpose. The fixing of this year would enable us to understand H.s mythic chronology.

30 (22) The fragment is taken from the 'Ιέπειαι. This is proved by the mention of the issue of Orestes' trial in connection with succinct but sufficient statements about the earlier trials. These clearly had not occurred earlier in the account, which is impossible for the *Atthis*, whereas the dating of Attic events by calculating back in generations  
 35 accords well with the universal chronicle <sup>1</sup>). Incidentally the fragment of course enlarges our knowledge of the contents of the *Atthis*: in this work H. recorded not only the first trial attested by F 1, but the four famous mythic trials; and he certainly did so under the corresponding kings, who were obtained by reckoning back

by generations, *viz.* Kekrops <sup>3</sup>), Erechtheus <sup>3</sup>), Aigeus <sup>4</sup>). This again favours the assumption that a list of nine pre-Trojan kings occurred also in the *Atthis* <sup>5</sup>). It has been argued on F 1 <sup>6</sup>) that (and why) H. accepted the trial of Orestes which Aischylos had invented, not how-  
 5 ever treating (as the poet did) the earlier trials as non-existent. We may assume him to have followed Aischylos also in this that he named Argos as the residence of king Agamemnon: Mykene had become politically unimportant since the destruction by Argos in the second half of the sixties, and we may be sure that H. did not plead the Spartan  
 10 claim to Agamemnon and Orestes <sup>7</sup>). Only the accusers come ἐκ Λακεδαιμόνου and, according to general considerations, they must be those who were qualified by kinship to be the avengers. Whom he mentioned as holding this position cannot be said, nor is it very important <sup>8</sup>). But it *is* important that he modernized here and replaced the persecuting Erinyes,  
 15 whom Aischylos had retained for very good reasons, by the relatives themselves. Actually they ought to have demanded extradition. Here we come upon a true legal problem which H. clearly perceived, for in his account the trial proper is preceded by extensive transactions with 'the Athenians' <sup>9</sup>). Presumably Tyndareos, or whoever it was, first  
 20 demanded the extradition of the murderer, and the Athenians answered by referring to the right of sanctuary of their Palladion <sup>10</sup>). In any case the outcome of the proceedings was the acknowledgement of the Attic court of justice by the Spartans. Under which year of Demophon H. entered the trial cannot be said; but there is no doubt that he gave a  
 25 definite year <sup>11</sup>). About the further fate of Orestes we expect only a brief remark in the *Atthis*; more would be expected (apart from the 'Ιέρειαι in which the Aeolian migration cannot have been omitted) in 'Αργολικά and Αιολικά. But we have merely the brief note that περί δὲ τῆς Ὀρέστου εἰς τὴν Αἰολίδα ἀπουκίας Ἑλλάνικος ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ Αἰολικῶν  
 30 ἰστόρηκεν <sup>12</sup>).

(23) The long historical report is uniform, and I see no reason for disputing the claim to it of H. who is cited in the opening for the descent of Kodros from Deukalion <sup>1</sup>). The provenance of the fragment from the *Atthis* is far more likely than from the *Deukalioneia*, because it shows  
 35 no trace of digressions, which the latter surely must have given for the individual members of the pedigree. The two Attic stories, on the other hand, are told with comparative fulness, and there must have followed a narrative even more detailed about the Ionian migration, which the scholiast only mentioned in passing because it was of no importance for

his purpose <sup>3</sup>). That looks as if the pedigree, which had to be treated in detail in the *Deukalionia*, was repeated here retrospectively and with a brevity suited to the matter in hand <sup>3</sup>). Incidentally this pedigree also favours the view that H.'s pre-Trojan list in the *Atthis* also showed nine kings only <sup>4</sup>); for Deukalion, who according to later Attidographers was a contemporary of Kekrops <sup>5</sup>), is assigned here to the thirteenth generation before Medon; the Parian Marble, on the other hand, reckons the round number of 500 years, *i.e.* fifteen generations between Kekrops' accession and the Ionian migration. The excerpt manifestly starts from section 2 which determines its position in the *Atthis*: H. recorded the passing of the Attic kingdom from the family of the (Theseids or Erechthids <sup>6</sup>) to that of the (Melanthids or Medontids. Section 1 explains (retrospectively) how it happened that the Medontids came to Athens <sup>7</sup>). Section 3 continues the account, immediately connecting it with the first king of the new family by the history of his son Kodros and (here only the beginning is preserved) his successors. It is very uncertain whether H. knew more about the first two kings than is narrated here. To follow up the details of the two stories would lead us too far afield and would not teach us much in regard to H. The tradition is uniform in the main lines <sup>8</sup>); the pedigree of the 'Neleids' had been handed down to H.; how far it was he who effected the rationalisation for the purpose of establishing a complete post-Trojan king-list, can hardly be ascertained <sup>9</sup>). The Melanthos story appears fully rationalized in the excerpt of the Plato scholiast <sup>10</sup>) or, in other terms, shows no profound interest in Athenian cults and their connection with the old order of the state. It concludes (as one expects in a historical narrative, and in the ordinary form with  $\delta\theta\epsilon\nu$ ) with the establishment of the Apaturia. Herodotos treats the significance of the festival for the Athenian claim to leadership in Ionia as an acknowledged fact <sup>11</sup>); its mention would anyhow be expected in the *Atthis*; also the function of the festival may have been the same as in Herodotos <sup>12</sup>). The scholiast derives the name—linguistically an impossible derivation, but he indicates no doubt—from  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta$ , using the connecting link of an (invented) form  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\nu\acute{\omicron}\rho\iota\alpha$  <sup>13</sup>). Pherekydes knew the story of Kodros' sacrificial death in its details. This is important, because we then have no reason to deny that the same applies to Herodotos <sup>14</sup>). The *Atthis* of Strabo's source (Apollodoros) brings the story into a causative connection with that of Melanthos; we may assume the same for H. <sup>15</sup>). It is not his invention but Attic tradition known already to Herodotos <sup>16</sup>) that with Melanthos a *genos* immigrated



from the Pylos of Neleus and replaced the autochthonous Erechtheidai, a *genos* usually called Μεδοντίδαι after the third king in the series <sup>17</sup>). Therefore the tradition, though scanty, is uniform: even for the time after Troy we find no vestige of fluctuations in the king-list proper <sup>18</sup>).

5 We may further infer that this tradition was at one time established by an authoritative historian, who can have been no other than H. <sup>19</sup>). But there does exist a difference as to the constitutional position of this second dynasty: they are called either βασιλεῖς like the sovereigns of the first dynasty, or ἄρχοντες διὰ βίου, the latter designation however

10 not being applied until we reach the third of the series, the same man who gives the name to the *genos*. As the authors of the recent treatments of the Athenian king-list <sup>20</sup>) (particularly those with a historical purpose) presented the tradition either in an incomplete form or not without prejudice (under the influence of their historical aim), I shall present it

15 again: (1) The first conception is represented in the *Parian Marble* which dates its entries without an exception by βασιλεύοντος Ἀθηνῶν τοῦ δεῖνα down to the year 683/2 B.C. (ἀφ' οὗ κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἤρξεν ὁ ἄρχων) <sup>21</sup>). That is not a negligence or an error but the tradition of an *Atthis* which, if it is not H., agrees with him <sup>22</sup>). Our early witnesses universally are in

20 accord with him. Very cautious scholars may leave Herodotos out of the discussion because he mentions only the first two of the new line of kings, *viz.* Melanthes and Kodros <sup>23</sup>); but the words of H. that Kodros ἀπέθανε καταλιπὼν τὴν ἀρχὴν Μέδοντι τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ τῶν παίδων can only be interpreted as meaning that he regarded the successors of Kodros

25 as kings like him (how many of them may at present remain an open question <sup>24</sup>)), and we actually have a tradition about the pre-history of the Ionian migration according to which Medon and his younger brother Neileus quarrelled about the βασιλεία τῶν Ἀθηναίων <sup>25</sup>). Further Plato says that Kodros died ὑπὲρ τῆς βασιλείας τῶν παίδων <sup>26</sup>), and if

30 he used an *Atthis* for statements of that kind it can only have been that of H. <sup>27</sup>). Lastly Aristotle followed this version, perhaps in *Politics* <sup>28</sup>), and certainly in the lost opening of the narrative part of the Ἀθπ., if the story of the last Kodrid Hippiomenes is to supply the reason for the fact that ἀπὸ τῶν Κοδριδῶν οὐκέτι βασιλεῖς ἠιροῦντο <sup>29</sup>). Therefore

35 it must have been stated in one (or more) of the *Atthides* known to Aristotle that Hippiomenes was the last *king* of the second dynasty. (2) The same Aristotle in the (later) ch. 3 of the same work is seemingly the first witness for the second conception. For it is for him a fact that the Kodridai gave up the βασιλεία as early as under Medon (although it

had only been acquired by Kodros' father Melanthos). Aristotle cites οἱ πλείους for this fact; it is only in a note that he gives the view of ξῖνοι<sup>30</sup>) that the change did not take place until the time of Medon's son Akastos, and he attaches no great importance to that view because the difference in time is small. Unfortunately we cannot tell where he found this version of the development of Attic royalty, but we may with certainty assume that there were Atthidographers among the πλείους, and it seems a probable suggestion that one of the representatives (if not the originator) was Kleidemos. This early date for introducing responsibility (in some sense) of the supreme official<sup>31</sup>) would be well in accord<sup>32</sup>) with the fundamentally democratic attitude<sup>33</sup>) of that Atthidographer. It would also be quite possible chronologically, for we may ascribe the same view with a high degree of probability to Ephoros, for whom Hippomenes is Ἀθηναίων ἄρχων, not βασιλεύς<sup>34</sup>). But whether or no our inferences concerning Kleidemos and Ephoros are correct, Aristotle's mode of expression leaves no doubt of the fact that to the originator of this conception the supreme official of Athens from the third Medontid onward was no longer the king (whose office was however by no means abolished by the change<sup>35</sup>)) but the archon, who at first holds his office for life. We learn particulars about this conception from witnesses who seem all to be late: (a) The difference between kingship and archonship, that also was for life, is stated in Pausanias 4, 5, 10: τοὺς γὰρ ἀπὸ Μελάνθου, καλουμένους δὲ Μεδοντίδας, κατ' ἀρχὰς μὲν ἀφείλοντο ὁ δῆμος τῆς ἐξουσίας τὸ πολὺ καὶ ἀντὶ βασιλείας μετέστησαν ἐς ἀρχὴν ὑπεύθυνον, ὕστερον δὲ καὶ προθεσμίαν ἐτῶν δέκα ἐποίησαν αὐτοῖς τῆς ἀρχῆς<sup>36</sup>). (b) The reason for the change in the constitution is treated by Pompeius Trogus in a digression in his Persian history<sup>37</sup>). Unfortunately we only have the excerpt made by Justinus who according to his manner relates with comparative fulness the exemplary story of Kodros' sacrificial death, despatching the history of the constitution in the most careless manner: *post Codrum nemo Athenis regnavit, quod memoriae eius tributum est. administratio rei publicae annuis magistratibus permessa. sed civitati nullae tunc leges erant, quia libido regum pro legibus habebatur. legitur itaque Solon, vir iustitiae insignis, qui velut novam civitatem legibus conderet*<sup>38</sup>). (c) This motivation was submerged in a phrase of the historical summary of Velleius, who wrote not much later than Trogus; but instead he supplies the details of the development of the constitution which Justinus skipped over: *eodem tempore* (return of the Herakleidai) *Athenae sub regibus esse desierunt, quarum ultimus rex*

*fuit Codrus, Melanthis filius, vir non praetereundus* (his sacrificial death); *Codrum cum morte aeterna gloria Athenienses secuta victoria est. quis eum non miretur qui his artibus mortem quaesierit, quibus ab ignavis vita quaeri solet?* huius filius Medon primus archon Athenis fuit; ab hoc posterius apud Atticos dicti Medontidae, sed hic insequentesque archontes usque ad Charopem dum viverent eum honorem usurpabant (institution of the Olympic games). tum Athenis perpetui archontes esse desierunt, cum fuisset ultimus Alcmaeon, coeperuntque in denos annos creari; quae consuetudo in annos LXX mansit, ac deinde annuis commissa est magistratibus res publica: ex iis qui denis annis prae fuerunt primus fuit Charops, ultimus Eryxias, ex annuis primus Creon <sup>39</sup>). I shall not enter into the particulars about the sources of Trogius, Velleius, or Pausanias <sup>40</sup>), but we may state that the evidence quoted can be combined into a uniform account of the development of the Athenian supreme office, and that it represents the conception of both Ephoros and Atthidography. Perhaps we had better say, the conception which became predominant in fourth century Atthidography and which almost certainly was given by Philochoros, for it has come down to us that he dated Homer ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἀθήνησιν Ἀρχιππου <sup>41</sup>). The statement is corroborated by the fact that this tradition is in full accord, as to the names and as to the dates, with Kastor's Ἐπιτομὴ ἱστορικὴ (a work much used in Roman times), the only witness who gives a complete king-list <sup>42</sup>). But Kastor for Greek matters follows Eratosthenes and Apollodoros, and in regard to these two we may assume with full certainty that they took their Attic dates mainly from Philochoros, and the fundamental lines of their historical narrative from Ephoros.

The survey of the tradition shows unmistakably that in the fourth century there existed two conceptions of the development of the Athenian supreme office: a simple conception regarding the archon as the immediate successor of the βασιλεύς, and a more complicated conception which finds within the period of the kings a development from βασιλεία to ἀρχὴ διὰ βίου, the latter dating the title ἄρχων for the supreme official approximately four centuries further back than the other, viz. from 1069/8 instead of 683/2 B.C. (according to Kastor's list, i.e. probably the chronology of Eratosthenes). It is common to both conceptions that they consider the supreme ruler only, i.e. the βασιλεύς, or the ἄρχων who holds only that official name, not ἄρχων ἐπώνυμος <sup>43</sup>); and the intermediate stage of the ἄρχοντες δεκαετείς, who according to their nature are more ἄρχοντες than βασιλεῖς, can be connected with either conception, for they are probably merely a chronological construction,

'historically' important only so far as the first of these ἀρχοντες δεκαετείς were still taken from the family of the Medontidai <sup>44</sup>).

I shall now enumerate simply in their chronological sequence the representatives of the two conceptions, marking with an asterisk those included in each list without full certainty. The representatives of the simple conception are: H., Plato, \*Androtion, the early Aristotle, the *Atthis* of the Parian Marble. Those of the more complicated conceptions are: the πλείους of Aristotle, to whom \*Kleidemos belongs; Ephoros, the later Aristotle, Philochoros and the later general opinion as found in  
 10 Kastor, Trogus, Velleius, Pausanias. It is evident that the second conception is that of later Atthidography; we supposed that Kleidemos introduced it for political reasons in contradiction of H., and it became the general opinion because Ephoros and Aristotle accepted it (the latter with particular complications of which I shall speak presently),  
 15 and for later writers because of the authority of Philochoros' *Atthis*. According to the second conception the legend of the sacrificial death of Kodros (a legend considerably older in itself <sup>45</sup>) is made to end with the obvious invention that the Athenians in honour of Kodros abolished βασιλεία (as the supreme office), introducing instead the archonship for  
 20 life (which for a long time after remained the hereditary possession of the Kodridai <sup>46</sup>). We can perhaps not decide with full certainty whether this new ending originated earlier, perhaps was already known to H., who ignored it (like the legend of Theseus' democracy) when constructing the first king list, or whether it was Kleidemos who invented it in order  
 25 to give Athenian democracy a respectably high age; for this purpose the story was more suitable in which the people created the ὑπεύθυνος ἀρχή than the other invention according to which the king gave the people democracy as a present. Personally I have no doubt that the second alternative is by far the more probable <sup>47</sup>). In any case those who date  
 30 the new ending as late as the Roman times <sup>48</sup>) fail to recognize the tradition as well as the obviously political character of the invention, and lastly the nature of the Atthis generally. Atthidography adopted old stories more than once or even invented stories and did not always realize the constitutional implications of them <sup>49</sup>). The story of Kodros  
 35 may originally have been a simple aition which, being connected with a Peloponnesian war, gave the answer to the question why Athens was not ruled by kings like Sparta. Not until the new ending was appended did it obtain the political tinge and became the parallel to the invention which regarded Athenian democracy as a creation of Theseus, an in-

vention occurring not only in the poet Euripides but in the *Atthides* as well <sup>60</sup>). Anyone wishing to refute the latter invention could easily do so by referring to the king list: Pausanias, or rather his (Atthidographic) source did that <sup>61</sup>). The refutation of the Kodros story was less  
5 easy, supposing it was attempted, which is not probable in view of the series of authorities adduced above <sup>62</sup>). There existed no document on which the constitutional position of the persons accepted into the king list could be based; or if there was a document, as *e.g.* the oath of the nine archons which Aristotle uses as a proof, it seemed to corroborate  
10 the assumption of a royal power restricted in the course of time <sup>63</sup>). An actual problem did not arise until, proceeding beyond the primitive question as to when and why the archon replaced the king as a ruler, scholars began to investigate systematically the Athenian organization of officials. This problem is perfectly different from that of the early  
15 *Atthides*, which constructed the development of Athenian kingship from mythical stories originally not connected with each other and with mythical persons, and which dealt with the *gené* who had ruled Athens. The business of the 'new' research no longer was with 'the archon', but with the *ένέα ἀρχοντες* of the historical times. For these there  
20 were no old stories; the researchers had to work with documents and inferences <sup>64</sup>) in order to delimit from each other the duties and the rights of these nine supreme officials and incidentally determine their relations to the former βασιλεύς. This was done first (generally, not only for us) in the scientific πολιτεία and the preliminary studies for it in which  
25 Aristotle and his fellow workers were engaged <sup>65</sup>): we now find their results so far as they concern the history of archonship, in ch. 3 of the historical part of the 'Αθπ. (for the systematic establishing of the spheres of each office was done in the second part). The surprising point in these statements is that archonship is now given a history in which the actual  
30 ruler of historical Athens is proved to be the latest of the three ἀρχαί, who was placed only νεωστί at the side of the archon king and the polemarch; the θεσμοθέται alone, for whom Aristotle seems to have given a date, are later. Aristotle fitted this history of archonship, at which he arrived by inferences and constructions, into the historical account of  
35 the *Atthides*, and it implies the second version <sup>66</sup>): the date for the introduction of archonship is not the documentary year 683/2 B.C., with which the list of annual officials opens <sup>67</sup>), but a date four centuries earlier; it is the year in which the Kodridai gave up the βασιλεία and became ἀρχοντες; *i.e.* ἀρχοντες in the sense of the *Atthides*, not the nine officials

who formed a board established by Solon, but the eponymous holders of the supreme office <sup>58</sup>). The individual difficulties in ch. 3, which rather indicates than actually gives a history of archonship, are due to the very fact that it is a summary of comprehensive research, which had gone into details <sup>59</sup>). These difficulties as well as the contradiction to the story of Hippomenes given in the preceding historical part, and to that of the end of the Kodrid kings <sup>60</sup>), can most easily be explained by the supposition that ch. 3 was written at the same time and by the same person (I think Aristotle himself) who described the constitution of Draco in ch. 4: both chapters appear to be a later insertion in the Ms. of the *'Aθπ.*, an insertion breaking up the clear connexion between ch. 2 and ch. 5 <sup>61</sup>). The place of the two chapters, and the absence of the archon constitution in the survey of the eleven *μεταβολαί* <sup>62</sup>) given in ch. 41 point in the same direction as the abundance of antiquarian detail in ch. 3.

15 To summarize the making up of the Athenian king list by H.: we know that he assumed two dynasties, the first being autochthonous while the second had immigrated, and that he established a connexion between Athens and a pedigree starting from Deukalion <sup>63</sup>). Further, that the list began with Kekrops, and that down to Thymoites (with whom the 20 dynasty of the Erechtheidai came to an end) it probably included the same names as the list of Kastor with the exception of the duplicates Kekrops II and Pandion II: these two were probably inserted as late as the fourth century between Erechtheus and Aigeus <sup>64</sup>). The date for the change of dynasties is the return of the Herakleidai into the Peloponnese, 25 and this constitutes a further proof of the assumption that for the history of Athens, which was almost without dates, H. created a chronology by making a connexion between the schedule of Panhellenic history and the general chronology of the myths. Of the second dynasty we know for certain only the first three names down to the pair of brothers Medon- 30 Neileus, who are dated by the Ionian migration. Considering the doubts as to the number of the *δεκαετείς* <sup>65</sup>) the last portion of this list remains uncertain, and we do not know whether it gave the same 20 names which Kastor gave between Medon and Kreon <sup>66</sup>). But probability is in favour of the idea that here too the first construction of an Athenian king list 35 marked an epoch, and that as early as H. Hippomenes, the fourth *δεκαετής* in Kastor's list, was the last ruler of the dynasty of the Kodridai. This was the version in at least one of the *Atthides* used by Aristotle (Androtrion?) and in the *Atthis* used by Pausanias (Philochoros?) <sup>67</sup>). If my idea is correct, H. used the story of Hippomenes, which probably

was a genuine old aition <sup>68</sup>), as he used the Apaturia legend, and as one of his successors (Kleidemos?) used the story of Kodros, to afford an explanation for a supposed fact of history: the deed of Hippomenes was to explain why the Athenians (not long before the time of the first annual 5 archon Kreon) ἀπὸ Κοδριδῶν οὐκέτι βασιλεῖς ἤφρουντο, but instead elected archons, first for ten years, later for one. For there seems to me to be no doubt of H. having constructed the pedigree of the Melanthidai as he did that of the Erechtheidai, and in the same manner, with the only difference that he had much less traditional material at his disposal for 10 the second list: the earlier kings almost without exception occurred in single stories and they had only to be brought into a sequence and fitted into Panhellenic chronology; of the Medontidai however Hippomenes seems to have been the only one to whom a story was attached <sup>69</sup>). There was an empty space between the two dates, fixed for H. for 15 several reasons, of the Ionian migration and the first annual archon, and this he evidently filled with a series of Athenian names of distinguished sound. I make this inference not from the fact that we do not know a *genos* of Medontidai in historical times <sup>70</sup>), but because I do not feel myself able to acknowledge as a genuine pedigree of an Athenian 20 clan the list handed down to us <sup>71</sup>), while it seems to me perfectly intelligible as a construction built from names occurring in the great *gens* of the sixth and fifth centuries. I therefore feel profoundly suspicious towards any attempt at making H. use documentary evidence out of which we could reconstruct real history <sup>72</sup>).

25 (24) We must first try to state with whom H. was dealing, and from which of his books the fragment derives. It seems to be certain that in this instance too the pedigree was given retrospectively on the occasion of the first appearance of a historical person or of a historical event <sup>1</sup>). If this is true H. hardly gave all the intermediate links, which Pherekydes 30 naturally enumerated when tracing the pedigree of the Philaids <sup>2</sup>). Plutarch and the Suda gave it in connexion with the orator Andokides, who was born about 440 B.C. <sup>3</sup>), whose first political utterance falls earlier than the ostracism of Hyperbolos in 417 B.C. <sup>4</sup>), and who later played an important part in the affair of the Herms 416/4 <sup>5</sup>). On this 35 occasion Plutarch gives the note about his descent from Odysseus. The pedigree may (not must) have had the same place in the Vita of Andokides excerpted in the brief article of the Suda which defines the descent more accurately by mentioning Telemachos and Nausikaa <sup>6</sup>). Ps. Plutarch, who only gives the remote divine ancestor Hermes <sup>7</sup>), is also talking of

the orator, but the text is not sound and, moreover, the author has confused matters: (1) It was not Andokides' father Leogoras who signed the peace in 446/5 B.C. but his grandfather, who was also named Andokides, the strategos of 446/5 and 441/0 B.C. <sup>8)</sup>, who may well have been still living at the time when assistance was sent to Korkyra in 433/2 B.C. This corruption of the text is healed by Ruhnken's <τοῦ Ἀνδοκίδου>. (2) The Andokides sent to Korkyra μετὰ Γλαύκωνος in 433/2 B.C. cannot be the orator, who then was hardly ten years old; it was either his grandfather Andokides or his father Leogoras. The former alternative is favoured by Thukydides 1, 51, 4 τοῖς δὲ Κερκυραίοις στρατοπεδευομένοις ἐπὶ τῇ Λευκίπτηι αἱ εἴκοσι νῆες αἱ ἐκ τῶν Ἀθηνῶν αὐται, ὧν ἤρχε Γλαύκων τε ὁ Λεάγρου καὶ Ἀνδοκίδης ὁ Λεωγόρου . . . κατέπλεον. Ps. Plutarch and the scholia attest the reading Ἀνδοκίδης, both wrongly referring the name to the orator <sup>9)</sup>. The exception taken by modern writers is founded on the accounts for the Korkyrean expedition *I G<sup>2</sup> I 295*, which is now supplemented thus: παρέδοσαν στρατηγούς ἐς Κόρ[χυραν τοῖς δευτέρ]οις ἐκπέσοι Γλαύκωνι [ἐκ Κεραμέου, Μεταγ]ένει Κοιλεῖ, Δρακοντί[δει Θοραιεῖ]. It is by no means so certain that one must simply amend Thukydides according to the document as Stahl assumed it to be, although his treatment of the text has carried the day <sup>10)</sup>. It is surely not plausible that Thukydides 'made a slip' confusing Drakonides with Andokides <sup>11)</sup>, even if it were true (I do not believe it is) that the former also was a son of a Leogoras <sup>12)</sup>; nor can we ascribe the mistake 'to an earlier copyist' <sup>13)</sup>, for if Thukydides named the first and the third general he must have named the second too <sup>14)</sup>, as in 1, 45, 3 he enumerated all three generals who commanded the first squadron sent out by the Athenians. I am not prepared to admit that a 'slightly' inaccurate expression of the historian (making Andokides appear as strategos, which he was not <sup>15)</sup>) is to be explained by the assumption that Thukydides knew, and was interested in, the fact that Andokides was attached to the second squadron not as a general, but as a sort of ambassador <sup>16)</sup> on account of his genealogical connexion with Korkyra. Apart from this suggestion there are, in my opinion, three ways out of the difficulty: (a) καὶ Ἀνδοκίδης ὁ Λεωγόρου is a note made by Thukydides himself in the margin of his manuscript and brought into the text by the editor; cf. e.g. the certain case in 2, 5-6 <sup>17)</sup>. (b) A whole line has dropped out from a text which was for instance Γλαύκων τε ὁ Λεάγρου καὶ <Μεταγένης (?) ὁ \* καὶ Δρακοντίδης ὁ \* πρεσβευτῆς δὲ ξυνέπλει> Ἀνδοκίδης ὁ Λεωγόρου. The omission would be explained by the resemblance



of the names Λεάγρου and Λεωγόρου on the one hand, Δρακοντίδης and Ἀνδοκίδης on the other. (c) The second name (τε)-καὶ Ἀνδοκίδης ὁ Λεωγόρου is an interpolation from the Vita of Andokides, which (as Ps. Plutarch shows) knows of Andokides' participation in the expedition either from the 5 psephism itself or from a contemporary author (n. 16; below p. 53, 26 ff.) and of the reason for it. We cannot determine which of the three possibilities meets the case; personally I prefer the third. Such an interpolation is easily conceivable, for the text of Thukydides was in the hands of the rhetors who were particularly interested in Andokides, and of 10 course this text, like any other, is not exempt from small interpolations of matter <sup>18</sup>). (3) The connexion of Andokides with the Kerykes, given only by Ps. Plutarch, is wrong <sup>19</sup>). A pedigree going back to Hermes by way of Telemachos has no connexion with that of the Kerykes save in so far as this too started from the 'herald of the gods' <sup>20</sup>). That such a 15 connexion was no foundation for a relationship was well known to an expert in pedigrees like H.; nor did Andokides claim relationship <sup>21</sup>). The question may remain open whether the sentence καθήκει γὰρ — γένος must be eliminated from the text with Blass, and it is of no great importance whether the inappropriate piece of information originates from the 20 biographer himself or from an interpolator who made a wrong use of a book about Attic families <sup>22</sup>). Such books belong among the tools of the interpreters of the orators, and I am much inclined to believe that the double statement of a deme (Κυδαθήναιος ἢ Θορεύς) does not in its second part furnish the otherwise unknown deme of Drakontides <sup>23</sup>), 25 but was taken from the same book Περὶ τῶν Ἀθήνησι γενῶν: Kephalos, the son of Hermes and Herse, who occurred in the pedigree going back ultimately to Hermes (or in one of its variants), lived according to Pherekydes (?) in the deme Θοραεῖς <sup>24</sup>). We thus obtain for H. a pedigree all the members of which we are not able to supply and which certainly 30 was not expounded fully in the *Atthis*. Hermes was at the head, and the pedigree led to the ancestor of the clan of the Andokids by way of Kephalos and of Telemachos' marriage with Nausikaa. Where H. gave it is not quite certain <sup>25</sup>). One would think that he mentioned the descent when he came for the first time upon a man from that family. That 35 probably did not happen as early as 446/5 B.C.: we are not justified in assuming that H. (like the later *Atthides*) supplied whole boards of strategoi or the signatories of even important treaties. The remaining possibilities are 433/2 and 416/5 B.C., and the former is more likely: for the information given by Ps. Plutarch διὸ καὶ προεχειρίσθη must

derive from a contemporary source, and in view of the causative form an author is more probable than a psephism<sup>26</sup>). In the biography, the first *topos* of which was the origin, the sending to Korkyra was narrated concerning the orator and in connexion with the outrage on the 5 Herms. In the former and more probable case, H. was speaking about the grandfather of the orator<sup>27</sup>), and F 24 belongs to the history of the 'Corinthian War'<sup>28</sup>) (*i.e.* possibly in the 'Ιέρειαι); in the second case it belongs perhaps in the neighbourhood of F 8.

(25-26) Schol. Aristoph. *Ran.* 33 πρὸς τοὺς χρόνους· ὅτι ἐν τῷ  
 10 προτέρῳ ἔτι ἐπὶ 'Αντιγένοῦς<sup>1</sup>) (407/6) B.C.) περὶ 'Αργίνουσαν ἐνίκων  
 ναυμαχίαι 'Αθηναῖοι συμμαχοῦντων δούλων ... οὐστίναις ἠλευθέρωσαν.  
 Xenoph. *Hell.* I, 6, 24 οἱ δὲ 'Αθηναῖοι ... ἐψηφίσαντο βοηθεῖν ναυσὶ  
 ἑκατὸν καὶ δέκα, εἰσβιβάζοντες τοὺς ἐν ἡλικίαι ὄντας ἅπαντας καὶ δούλους  
 καὶ ἔλευθέρους, καὶ πληρώσαντες τὰς δέκα καὶ ἑκατὸν ἐν τριάκοντα  
 15 ἡμέραις ἀπῆραν· εἰσέβησαν δὲ καὶ τῶν ἱππέων πολλοί. Diod. 13, 97, 1  
 (406/5 B.C.) 'Αθηναῖοι ... ἐποίησαντο πολίτας τοὺς μετοίκους καὶ τῶν  
 ἄλλων ξένων τοὺς βουλομένους συναγωνίσασθαι· ταχὺ δὲ πολλοῦ πλήθους  
 πολιτογραφηθέντος, οἱ στρατηγοὶ κατέγραφον τοὺς εὐθέτους εἰς τὴν στρα-  
 20 τείαν<sup>2</sup>)· παρεσκευάζοντο δὲ ναῦς ἐξήκοντα. We have [inferred from  
 these fragments, though not from them alone, that H. narrated the  
 Peloponnesian War down to its end, and certainly προθεὶς τὸν ἄρχοντα<sup>3</sup>).  
 The dispute as to whether the date given for the enfranchisement of  
 the slaves *etc.* is correct, does not affect this main question; it is of no  
 great importance anyhow<sup>4</sup>) or, one had better say, not to be decided.  
 25 For we cannot conclude with certainty from the succinct scholion  
 whether H. recorded the decree (promise of liberty) or the carrying of  
 it into effect, or (to put the question into terms of constitutional law)  
 whether the slaves were entered as citizens before being enlisted or after  
 the battle. The former alternative is, in my opinion, more likely: the  
 30 assumption that the enfranchisement was decreed before the battle  
 (*i.e.* in the year of Antigenes 407/6 B.C.) is favoured by the second  
 emergency measure, *viz.* the coinage of gold, which was needed for the  
 payments; the assumption that the slaves obtained enfranchisement  
 before being entered in the catalogue of those bound for military service,  
 35 is favoured by general considerations and by the account of Diodoros  
 (notwithstanding the fact that he forgets the slaves; Xenophon is as  
 inaccurate as he always is when relying on his memory, and he is more  
 interested in the knights than in the slaves). If these inferences are  
 correct everything falls into place: the battle was fought in 406/5 B.C.<sup>5</sup>),

presumably in the first month of that year <sup>6</sup>). The preparations took thirty days according to Xenophon; the decrees therefore probably belong to the last month of 407/6 B.C. In that case F 25/26 actually 'furnish the proof of H.s chronological accuracy' <sup>7</sup>) unless he assigned the battle 5 itself to the wrong year 407/6 B.C. This is what the scholiast does, who therefore says *ναυμαχίσαντας* <sup>8</sup>). I do not find this sufficient for assuming a mistake in H. too. About the *Nikai* see Thompson *Athen. Stud. Ferguson* 1940, p. 199 ff.; Schweigert *Hesperia* 9, 1940, p. 309 ff. It is very unlucky that the scholiast excerpted only what refers to Aristophanes; we should 10 be pleased to have some information about the attempt of Athens at forming connexions with Karthago <sup>9</sup>).

(27) The two principles of explanation with their representatives are the same as in F 1. The mythic explanation cited from the *Danaïd* and Pindar, is severely abridged; for Kekrops <sup>1</sup>) and Erechtheus <sup>2</sup>) 15 are competitors for the name of the Attic autochthon. The Atthidographers seem to have preferred the story of Hephaistos and Erichthonios <sup>3</sup>), once Erichthonios and Erechtheus had become two different persons, as they certainly were in H.s king list <sup>4</sup>). This author hardly accepted the myth of birth from the earth (Thukydides 20 also criticised it tacitly <sup>5</sup>)), but we may assume for certain that he treated the question of autochthony in the *Atthis* <sup>6</sup>). It is, however, uncertain whether this happened in a somewhat extended digression, and whether H. when discussing the question considered the similar claims of other Greek tribes. It is improbable (even if the much abridged 25 quotation is wholly taken from the *Atthis* <sup>7</sup>)) that he meant to plead the claim of the Athenians to be the only, or at least the oldest, autochthones <sup>8</sup>). The most plausible assumption would be that he acknowledged the claim in the same sense as Thukydides did, *viz.* that Attica was not involved in the migrations.

30 (28) Ch. 36 is a regrettable example not only of Plutarch's lack of understanding of Herodotos but of actual *κακοθήθεια* on Plutarch's part. Concerning the matter, Herodotos in any case has the prior claim to be heard both because he was nearer to the events and because he endeavoured to obtain the local traditions of the towns 35 of Asia Minor and of some of the islands <sup>1</sup>). If he was in Naxos (which cannot be proved but is not unlikely <sup>2</sup>)) he saw the monument or the dedicatory epigram of Demokritos quoted by Plutarch as having been composed by Simonides, and he obtained his special information perhaps from the man who showed him the monument,

not from Demokritos himself or his descendants<sup>3</sup>). Of course we cannot now judge whether Herodotos was right in giving Demokritos the credit for the fact that the contingent, which Naxos as subject to Persia<sup>4</sup>) had to provide for the fleet of Xerxes, went over to the Greeks before the battle of Salamis<sup>5</sup>). Those who contend that the leaders had received on departing secret orders to join the Greeks if possible cannot be refuted; evidently Plutarch believed that this was so. Whether or no such an assumption is probable (in view of the total situation before 480 B.C. I do not think it is) nothing of the kind is found in the local tradition of Naxos. Their claim was justified and proved by documents as we read it in Diod. 5, 52, 3: ἐπιδοῦναι γὰρ τὴν νῆσον εἰς εὐδαιμονίαν, καὶ ναυτικὰς τε δυνάμεις ἀξιολόγους συστήσασθαι, καὶ ἀπὸ Ξέρξου πρώτους ἀποστάντας ἀπὸ τοῦ ναυτικοῦ συγκαταναυμαχῆσαι τὸν βάρβαρον, καὶ τῆς ἐν Πλαταιαῖς παρατάξεως οὐκ ἀσήμως μετασχεῖν<sup>6</sup>). It is hardly possible to concede good faith to Plutarch when he cites as a proof of the Hellenic patriotism of the Naxians in 480 B.C. the *Ναξιῶν ὠρογράφοι* for the attitude of the island in the years 500 and 491 B.C.<sup>7</sup>) and excerpts nothing for 481/0 and 480/79 B.C., although this would at once have explained the contradiction between Herodotos on the one hand and H. and Ephoros on the other—if a contradiction really existed. It looks as if there was none: the numbers of ships, six and five, supplied by H. and Ephoros, manifestly derive from the dedicatory epigram of Demokritos; thus the difference between them is to be explained<sup>8</sup>). I should not now suggest that they 'misunderstood the epigram'<sup>9</sup>); the misunderstanding (if such it is and not a deliberate perversion) falls to Plutarch. The result for H. is that F 28 is more likely to derive from the *Persika* than from the *Atthis*: it is not probable that in the one historical book of the latter there should have been room for an account of the Xerxes War treating each battle so fully that it enumerated the several contingents with their numbers, the names of their trierarchs, and their achievements.

(29) The provenance of this quotation and of two others concerning Sparta<sup>1</sup>) cannot be established with certainty. The *Ἰέρειαι* does not enter into the question because this work did not treat the post-Trojan migrations until the second book<sup>2</sup>). In the *Atthis* the Dorian migration appeared in the first book in so far as H. narrated in it the attack of the Heraclids on the Athens of Kodros<sup>3</sup>), but it is hardly probable that in doing so he should have discussed conditions in Laconia in detail. If one has the courage to supplement ἐν τῇ 'Α<τθ(δ)><sup>4</sup>) one may suppose that the passage occurred apropos of the last great Messenian revolt 464/3-

455/4 B.C. <sup>6</sup>), which Philochoros F 117 makes the starting point of Athenian hegemony. The assumption would be corroborated by the fact that Thukyd. I, 101, 2 inserts into that context a succinct remark about the origin of helotry, which may very well be directed at H. <sup>6</sup>):

5 διεκωλύθησαν δὲ (*scil.* οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι) ὑπὸ τοῦ γενομένου σεισμοῦ, ἐν ᾧ καὶ οἱ Εἰλωτες καὶ τῶν περιόικων Θουριᾶται τε καὶ Αἰθαιῆς ἐς Ἰθώμην ἀπέστησαν· πλείστοι δὲ τῶν Εἰλώτων ἐγένοντο οἱ τῶν παλαιῶν Μεσσηνίων τότε δουλωθέντων ἀπόγονοι <sup>7</sup>). The political Atthidographers treated the revolt in detail, because it affected Athens in many ways <sup>8</sup>,

10 and the great fourth century historians perceived that Thukydides had set forth a different theory: Ephoros 70 F 117 repeats the explanation of H., but Theopompos 115 F 122 gives the option between the two accounts.

### 323. KLEIDEMOS OF ATHENS

15 Kleidemos was Athenian <sup>1</sup>) and an exegetes <sup>2</sup>). The few corruptions of the name are slight and give no cause for doubt on the authorship of any of the citations <sup>3</sup>). The name, however, appears in two forms: Κλειδήμος is found in Philodemos <sup>4</sup>), Plutarch <sup>5</sup>), Athenaios <sup>6</sup>), Harpokration <sup>7</sup>), Συναγωγὴ Λέξεων <sup>8</sup>), Photios <sup>9</sup>), the scholia on Kallimachos <sup>10</sup>),

20 Tertullian <sup>11</sup>), Constant. Porph. <sup>12</sup>); Κλειτόδημος in Pausanias the Periegetes <sup>13</sup>) and Pausanias Atticista <sup>14</sup>), the scholia on Euripides <sup>15</sup>), and Hesychios <sup>16</sup>). Both forms are correct, but only the first seems to occur in the inscriptions <sup>17</sup>), and it is the form used in Athens in the fourth century. We should know from almost contemporary evidence

25 that the Atthidographer called himself Kleidemos if we were certain that Aristotle and Theophrastos <sup>18</sup>) are quoting him or a relative of his <sup>19</sup>). We cannot positively identify Kleidemos with any of the bearers of the name occurring in the inscriptions. Kirchner in *P. A.* 8494 thinks of the secretary to the judges in a *διαδικασία* of the year 383/2 B.C. Κλειδήμος

30 Αἰνῆσ- <sup>20</sup>). But it is perhaps more likely that he belonged to the evidently distinguished family of the fourth century B.C. from the deme Melite (Kekropis), in which the names Koroiobos, Kleidemides, Kleidemos succeed each other. This does not mean that the family of the ἐξηγητῆς πυθόχρηστος (if K. belonged to this college) was a eupatrid one <sup>21</sup>).

35 A daughter of this family, Aristomache, married one Φιλόχορος Δημονίου <sup>22</sup>) so that our K. may be related to the last and most famous Atthidographer. Unhappily, even if this is correct, it does not help to fix

the date of K. more accurately. The assertion that he is the 'oldest' Atthidographer <sup>25</sup>) must not be doubted, even if it is only an inference <sup>26</sup>) from the point at which his work ended; but it does not give us an absolute date. Neither does his position at the beginning of the chronologically arranged list of Athenian historians T 3; for the work of Diyllos, son of the Atthidographer Phanodemos <sup>28</sup>), who follows K. in the list, extends beyond the year 297/6 B.C. The latest dateable fact mentioned by K. belongs to 415 B.C.; but this does not enable us to draw a conclusion as to the point at which his work ended, because of the small number <sup>10</sup> of historical fragments extant <sup>26</sup>). Everything depends on the gloss of Photios F 8 which, though succinct and difficult to understand, is not 'corrupt' <sup>27</sup>). As K. compares the symmories with the naukrariai <sup>28</sup>), it is probable that he was acquainted with the transfer of the symmory system from the income tax (property tax) to the trierarchy, and it is <sup>15</sup> certain from the wording of the text that the division into 100 symmories had been carried out when he wrote. The system was introduced for the tax in 388/7 B.C. <sup>29</sup>). It is very probable that the transfer to the trierarchy was effected in 358/7 by the law of Periandros <sup>30</sup>). Demosthenes proposed an alteration in 355/4 B.C. <sup>31</sup>). According to the text, the number of the <sup>20</sup> trierarchic symmories, at that time, was certainly 20, which makes the same number of symmories for the tax more than probable. The 100 symmories for tax assumed by Beloch <sup>32</sup>) and his followers <sup>33</sup>) are due to a misinterpretation of F 8 and to circular reasoning <sup>34</sup>). Demosthenes proposed that the number of the new μέρη (that is his name for the <sup>25</sup> subdivision of αἱ μεγάλαι αἱ εἴκοσι συμμορίαι) should be 100; and in my opinion the detailed character of his argumentation makes it impossible that 'the proposal for a reform is not necessarily new in this point' <sup>35</sup>). I hold that we cannot separate the 100 μέρη of K. from those of Demosthenes: on the contrary, we must conclude that the proposal for the <sup>30</sup> reform was effected 'in this point'. From this argument results the *terminus post* of 354 B.C. for the publication of K.'s *Atthis*. The *terminus ante* is the law concerning the trierarchs proposed by Demosthenes by which, as Lipsius in my opinion correctly remarks, 'the finding of the money was laid on the shoulders of the 300 προεισφέροντες exclusively'. <sup>35</sup> The assumption of Ed. Schwartz 'that we must date the earliest annalist not later than the middle of the fourth century' is quite correct <sup>36</sup>). It is corroborated by F 10 <sup>37</sup>) if it is allowable to connect the facts behind this narrative with the spoliation of the votive gifts in the Holy War. The *Atthis*, as the work is generally and naturally quoted <sup>38</sup>), is

called *Πρωτογονία* by Athenaios F 5a and Harpokration F 7. This is not another work by K. <sup>39)</sup>, nor is it a subtitle for book I only; for F 7 contains a historical fact from book III. Those who see in that title a 'transference from the first part to the whole' <sup>40)</sup> must, at the same time, 5 assume that the word <sup>41)</sup> was put by K. into the preface (title sentence). I see no cogent reason why, about 350, *Πρωτογονία* should not have been intended as the title of the book <sup>42)</sup>; and, if it was the title, this allows of an inference as to the spirit in which K. wrote. Quite apart from the public honour (T 2), the detailed accounts of Theseus <sup>43)</sup>, of the Persian <sup>44)</sup> 10 and the Peloponnesian Wars <sup>45)</sup>, prove that K. claimed literary merits: his *Atthis* was not a publication of documents <sup>46)</sup> like the *Exegetikon*, it was really a historical book and as such a work of literature <sup>47)</sup>. Four books are quoted <sup>48)</sup>, and there is no reason to assume that the earliest work of this kind written by an Athenian was more than twice the size 15 of the *Atthis* of Hellanikos <sup>49)</sup>; for no further on than the (beginning of the) third book the reforms of Kleisthenes were related <sup>50)</sup>. We have no clear notion of the style of the narrative; but it would be unreasonable to expect this earliest work of its kind to be on the same scale throughout. The fragments have conserved no date <sup>51)</sup>; it may, however, be assumed 20 that, at least in the historical times, K. narrated *κατ' ἀρχοντας* like Hellanikos before him, and before that *κατὰ βασιλείς*. It is only natural that we should have very few verbatim and very few narrative fragments: relating to historical times, where he was soon put into the background by successors who carried the narrative further, there is only F 10; 25 21/2; a few more, not all of them equally certain, belong to the history of the kings <sup>52)</sup>. Most of the fragments contain notes as to cults <sup>53)</sup>, constitutional points <sup>54)</sup>, descriptions of the country, and remarkable local details of various kinds <sup>55)</sup>. The endeavour, more or less occasional in Aristotle's 'Αθπ., to explain conditions and customs of the author's time 30 by history, is often evident. Book I probably contained the history of the colonization of Attica <sup>56)</sup> and, certainly, a concise description of the country in the manner of the old *Periegesis*. Here K. presumably did not confine himself to the territory of the town <sup>57)</sup>, for he also wrote about Eleusinian families <sup>58)</sup> and referred to the hostile neighbours <sup>59)</sup>. It cannot 35 be made out whether the early history of the kings was also contained in book I, for the only fragment known to be from book II seems to refer to the *Nostoi* <sup>60)</sup>. If F 15 belongs to the same book <sup>61)</sup> it included early Attic history, which means for K. the time before the democracy <sup>62)</sup>, from Kekrops or Demophon down to Peisistratos. In this case the two

books III-IV would remain for the history of Attica down to, at least, the Peloponnesian War <sup>63</sup>). The restoration of democracy in 403 B.C. would make a suitable conclusion for a work mostly looking towards the past. But it is most improbable from general considerations that K. 5 concluded his account half a century before his own time and that he entirely refrained from continuing the *Atthis* of the foreigner Hellanikos <sup>64</sup>); also, considering the scantiness of his legacy, one would hesitate to draw a conclusion *e silentio*. The earlier *Atthides* have this tendency towards the past in common with the early local chronicles; it was completely 10 overcome first by Philochoros, who assigned much of the antiquarian material to particular books on special subjects. The attitude of the earlier writers, usually but wrongly called romantic is not really in contrast with the rationalizing of the older times <sup>65</sup>). Rationalizing is a scientific principle, handed down to the sophists by the Ionian genealogists; 15 even Thukydides, though in the main averse from it, is not quite free from its influence here and there. Rationalizing alone made a continuous narrative possible which, while using fully all the local data, still needed much help from imagination. It was therefore bound to be in some respects, 'singular' <sup>66</sup>). The literary model seems to be Hellanikos, in 20 whose *Τρωικά* <sup>67</sup>) we are particularly well enabled to observe the outcome of the method. In comparison with some rather doubtful fragments of Philochoros the rationalism of K. might be called moderate; but even with him Daidalos flees to Athens *πλοῖωι*, and Ariadne, successor to Deukalion, makes a treaty with Theseus <sup>68</sup>). Another manifestation of 25 scientific method is the applying of etymology <sup>69</sup>). We cannot appraise the whole of K.'s achievement because we do not know how much working in archives and elsewhere he put into it; how much he gave in the matter of documents, and how far his successors found in his work this important material, most characteristic also for the literary species, or how much 30 of it they supplemented themselves. Certainly the amount of work put into it was considerable, in spite of the precedence of Hellanikos, if only one gives up the alleged 'Chronicle of the Exegetai' with which I have dealt sufficiently in *Atthis*. But it is only natural that K.'s *Atthis* fell into the background rather early: Istros and the Hellenistic scholars 35 made excerpts, and neither Plutarch or Pausanias can be supposed to have consulted the original.

Besides the *Atthis* Athenaios attests an 'Εξηγητικόν by K. <sup>70</sup>) and *Νόστοι* in at least 8 books <sup>71</sup>). The alteration of the name to 'Αντικλείδης <sup>72</sup>) is not likely, and I cannot bring myself to dispute the claim of the



Atthidographer to the former book, his interest in matters of cult being evident <sup>73</sup>). But the *Nóστοι* are impossible, if only because of the number of the books, if the *Atthis* contained only four. Moreover, one feels scruples about the untechnical use of the title. A specialized book about 'Home-  
 5 comings' gathering together mythical and historical matter would be of the same type as such Hellenistic collective works like *Περὶ βασιλέων, τυράννων*. It is, again, impossible that an *Atthis* should ever have been quoted as *Nόστοι* <sup>74</sup>), nor can *Nόστοι* mean 'the time when historical tradition is extant', even as a subtitle (C. Mueller; Wilamowitz) of, say,  
 10 the second book. This resource of supposing subtitles, much favoured though it is, seldom helps at all. Taking into consideration the improbability of the corruption of *Κλειδημος* to *Ἀντικλειδης* and the uncertainty of the text in the short introductory excerpt as well as in the quotation from Kleidemos, I now believe (differing from my former  
 15 opinion in *FGr Hist* 140 F 6) in a greater corruption: what Athenaios wrote must have been something like *ἐν β̄ περὶ νόστου Πεισιστράτου*. The alteration of  $\eta$  to  $\beta$  is a slight one, and the history of Peisistratos would fit well into the second book of the *Atthis*.

#### T(ESTIMONIES)

20 (1) Hecker's transposition *ὅποσοι Ἀθηναίων τὰ ἐπιχώρια* <sup>1</sup>) is hardly correct: Pausanias' source (Istros?) does not think of the foreigner Hellanikos, or omits him on purpose. For chronological and/or factual reasons there cannot be any question of other names (Hekataios, Pherekydes, Amelesagoras) as possible predecessors of K. On the other hand  
 25 in a book about Delphi one expects a qualification of *τὰ ἐπιχώρια* to show that it is of Athenian, not Delphic, tradition that Pausanias speaks.

(2) The immediate source of Tertullian is either Soranus or Her-  
 mippus of Berytos, both of whom lived in the second century A.D. <sup>2</sup>). But the story goes back ultimately to the psephism itself. The anecdotic  
 30 form <sup>3</sup>) does not discredit the fact, but whether it allows of the deduction that the honour was conferred on Kleidemos in his later years remains doubtful because of our ignorance as to what the early Hellenistic age knew about K.'s life and works. It is quite certain that the honour was conferred not on account of his style <sup>4</sup>), but for the subject-matter of his  
 35 writing, as was the case with Pindar <sup>5</sup>), and, perhaps, with Herodotos <sup>6</sup>); but it is perhaps not equally certain (although I see no reason for serious doubt) that it immediately followed the publication of his *Atthis*, or

that it was given in appreciation of the *Atthis* alone <sup>7</sup>). The publication being dated, say, between 354 and 340 B.C., it appears possible that the psephism belongs to the time when power was in the hands of Lykurgos, who may well be credited with conferring such an honour on K. At that time such things begin to occur more often outside Athens also <sup>8</sup>). The cases of Pindar and Herodotos certainly show that they were possible at any time, but they concern non-Athenians <sup>9</sup>), and the case of Herodotos, as a matter of fact, may be altogether different.

## F(RAGMENTS)

- 10 (1) The first words are hardly quite intact: I should prefer to understand that τὰ Ἰλισσοῦ is the end of the description of the right hand shore and πρὸς Ἄγραν the heading of the next passage <sup>1</sup>); then ἄνω would mean 'on the north' <sup>2</sup>), and the description, proceeding from the town, crosses the Ilissos to Agra, as Pausanias puts it (but in another place) 1, 19, 6 διαβᾶσι δὲ τὸν Ἰλισὸν χωρίον Ἄγραι καλούμενον καὶ καὶ Ἄγροτέρας ἐστὶν Ἀρτέμιδος <sup>3</sup>). In any case this is a bit of a periegesis the concise style of which with its enumerations, sometimes in the form of headings, one must not try to bring nearer to that of Pausanias. The lexicographer <sup>4</sup>) picked it out not because of any interest in the subject but—as the quotation from the fourth book makes evident—on account of the forms Ἄγρα-Ἄγραι <sup>5</sup>) which K., however, did not use indiscriminately: Ἄγρα F 1 is the hill (ὄρος ὑπὲρ τὸν Ἰλισὸν ἀρχόμενον Paus. *l.c.*), Ἄγραι F 9 is the suburb. *φ. 51, 24* JEust. *Il. B* p. 361, 27 ὅτι δὲ καὶ Ἄγροτέρα Ἄρτεμις, ὡς καὶ ὁ κωμικὸς (*Thesm.* 116; *Eq.* 660) δηλοῖ, ἢ καὶ Ἄγραία παρὰ Πλάτωνι κατὰ Πausανίαν (F 13 Schw) ἀπὸ χώρας πρὸς τῷ Ἰλισσῷ, ὡς κληῖσις Ἄγραι καὶ Ἄγρα, οὐ τὰ μικρὰ τῆς Δήμητρος ἤγετο (φησί) μυστήρια, ἀ ἐλέγετο τὰ ἐν Ἄγρας (πρὸς Ἄγραν μυστήρια *IG*<sup>2</sup> II 661; 847; 1231; Plut. *Demetr.* 26, 3), ὁμοίως τῷ ἐν Ἀσκληπιου. Synag. p. 334, 11 Ἄγραι· χωρίον ἔξω τῆς πόλεως (πρὸς τῷ Εἰλισσῷ Phot. Berol. p. 23, 7 Rei), ἱερὸν Δήμητρος, ἐν ὧ τὰ μικρὰ μυστήρια ἀγεται-  
 25 ὀνομασθῆναι δὲ αὐτὸ οἱ μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος, πρότερον Ἐλικώνα καλούμενον, οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔθνηρον εἶναι καὶ πλήρες ἀγρεύματος. Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἄγρα καὶ Ἄγραι· χωρίον, ἐνικῶς καὶ πληθυντικῶς. ἔστι καὶ (δὲ Meī) τῆς Ἀττικῆς πρὸ τῆς πόλεως, ἐν ὧ τὰ μικρὰ μυστήρια ἐπιτελεῖται, μίμημα (μήνυμα  
 30 R μήμημα Meī) τῶν περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον· ἐν ὧ λέγουσι καὶ τὸν Ἡρακλέα μεμυῆσθαι. Schol. Plat. *Phaedr.* 229 C Ἄγραίας Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν Ἰδρυσαν Ἀθηναῖοι διὰ τὸ ἔφορον εἶναι παντὸς ἀγρίου τῆν θεὸν κτλ. Pausan. 1, 19, 6 ἐνταῦθα

\*Ἄρτεμιν πρῶτων θηρεῦσαι λέγουσιν ἐλθοῦσαν ἐκ Δήλου, καὶ τὸ ἀγαλμα διὰ τοῦτο  
 εἶχειν τόξον. The difference between the grammarians on the one side  
 and the periegetai on the other is evident. The former give the material  
 facts for Agra: mysteries of Demeter and cult of Artemis Agrotera \*),  
 5 and from this they explain the name; the latter describe the district  
 with a view especially to Agra-Helikon. What K. in his description gave  
 besides Eileithyia and Poseidon cannot be made out; for the grammarian  
 who made the excerpt was merely interested in the form Ἄγγρα, which  
 occurred in K. only once (in a heading). One cannot *a priori* assert that  
 10 he must have mentioned Demeter and Artemis, nor can one conclude  
 from silence here together with F 9 that he did not mention them in his  
 first book. The historical note on the alteration of the name (πάλαι-νῦν)  
 is most characteristic of K. An etymological explanation would not be  
 out of his line 7), but for reasons of style it could not quite easily be placed  
 15 in the δς sentence, where one would expect it (διὰ τὴν Ἄρτεμιν κτλ.  
 or something like that). φ. 51, 27 Εἰλειθυία] IG<sup>2</sup> II 5099 (seat in  
 the theatre) Ἐρσεφόροις β̄ Εἰλειθυίας > ἐν Ἄγγρας. In the dedication to  
 Εὐκολίῃ IG<sup>2</sup> II 4682, found near the Ilissos, one also is inclined to  
 recognize her 8). Ὠρεῖθυια, assumed by Ruhnken 9), is tempting but  
 20 wrong as Oreithyia has her place on the right bank. φ. 52, 1 Ποσειδῶνος]  
 Pausan. 7, 24, 5 Ἐλικὴ πόλις καὶ Ἴωσι ἱερὸν ἀγιώτατον Ποσειδῶνος ἦν  
 Ἐλικωνίου· διαμεμένηκε δὲ σφισι καὶ ὡς ὑπὸ Ἀχαιῶν ἐκπεσόντες ἐς Ἀθήνας  
 καὶ ὕστερον ἐξ Ἀθηνῶν ἐς τὰ παραθαλάσσια ἀφίκοντο τῆς Ἀσίας, σέβεσθαι  
 Ποσειδῶνα Ἐλικῶνιον κτλ. The cult is attested in Ionia only 10). The  
 25 Attic Helikon is mentioned by K. only; therefore it seems to me to be  
 doubtful whether 'the name of the place has been merely inferred from  
 the cult', as Judeich 11) assumes. He concludes from the 'unique formula  
 at the end of the oath of the Heliasts' that the oath was sworn at the  
 eschara of Poseidon; for the gods invoked are Zeus, Poseidon, Demeter  
 30 instead of the usual Zeus, Apollon, Demeter 12).

(2) As K. is quoted for the topographical position this fragment may  
 be assumed to have had its place in the periegesis; a more detailed account  
 of Melanippos 1) must not be expected in it 2). The name of the Pnyx,  
 which is counted as belonging to Melite, is not explained till the third  
 35 book (F 7) in connexion with the historical narrative.

(3) Eust. Dion. Per. 427 ἦν δὲ τις μοῖρα Μακεδονίας Μάκετα (μακέτη Ddf)  
 λεγομένη, ἐξ ἧς καὶ ἡ Μακεδονία Μακετία ἐλέγετο. Hesych. s.v. Μακετία·  
 ἡ Μακεδονία. The subject of ἐξωικίσθησαν, which points to an expulsion  
 by force, is quite certainly not the Temenids 1) who, when they were

expelled from Argos, fled to Illyria and from there υπερβαλόντες ἐς τὴν ἔνω Μακεδονίην ἀπίκοντο ἐς Λεβαίην πόλιν <sup>3)</sup> whence, later on, they subjected τὴν ἄλλην Μακεδονίην <sup>3)</sup>. If K. had mentioned the κτίσις Μακεδονίας in his first book it could only have been in a survey of the origin of the Greek people and the distribution of its tribes. The ancestor of the Macedonians, the son of Zeus by Deukalion's daughter Thyia <sup>4)</sup>, or of Aiolos <sup>5)</sup>, would have found his place here. A survey of this kind is by no means impossible. But for the *Atthis* it is neither likely <sup>6)</sup> nor to be inferred from F 3, since that fragment does not necessarily deal with Macedonia at all, but only defines a place by the position of Μακετία and that of Αἰγιαλός. It is not clear what district K. has in view, because we do not know his map. Thracia does not appear impossible, even if ἔνω <sup>7)</sup> means 'to the north'. A Θράκιος Αἰγιαλός παρὰ Στρυμόνι is known to Hekataios I F 155, another near the Hebros (which cannot be meant here) to Herodotos 7, 59, 1. According to Herodotos <sup>8)</sup> and Thukydides <sup>9)</sup> Pelasgians were living in the Athos peninsula as well as in the Krestoneia between the Axios and the Strymon, and Pelasgians, who occur to the mind when exiles are mentioned in an *Atthis* <sup>10)</sup>, may be the subject here. Perhaps the fragment is part of a reply to Herodotos I, 56/8, who had made out the Athenians and Ionians to be Pelasgians and barbarians, and in giving such a reply K. would be in accordance with Thukyd. I, 2 and the idea of Attic autochthony <sup>11)</sup>.

(4) Three glosses (Rei). For the first see Harpokr. Sud. Synag. s.v. ἀδικίου; for the third Lex. rhet. p. 199, 32 Bkr; Et. M. (Gen.) p. 17, 46; for the second Herodt. 5, 89, 2: Αἰγινῆταί τε δὴ ἐδήμιον τῆς Ἀττικῆς τὰ παραθαλάσσια, καὶ Ἀθηναίοισι ὀρημένοισι ἐπ' Αἰγινήτας στρατεύεσθαι ἦλθε μαντήιον ἐκ Δελφῶν ἀποσχόντας ἀπὸ τοῦ Αἰγινήτεων ἀδικίου (αικίου d) τριήκοντα ἔτεα. Stein and Powell are presumably right in supposing this to be the paraphrase of an oracle, but wrongly explain the word as ἀδικημα (6, 87) or ἀνάρσια (5, 89, 3). It seems possible that K. dated back the contest between Athens and Aigina to the primeval times (period of the kings); but one must consider the possibility of a corruption of the number of the book from  $\bar{\Gamma}$  or  $\bar{\Delta}$ .

(5) Schol. T II. Σ 558 Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ καὶ νῦν τοὺς περὶ ἱερουργίαν πο-  
 30 νοιμένους Κήρυκας (κῆρυκας?) φασιν. In the abbreviated and not very remarkable treatise on cooks F 5b <sup>1)</sup> the same quotation from K. appears, first verbatim and then paraphrased. Of F 5a not more than ἔδρων - οἰνοχοοῦντες belongs to K. The gloss to ἔδρων, which term for him did not need an explanation, must be eliminated if only because of its position;

the explanation of the name ἀπό τοῦ κρείττονος like the paraphrase in 5b is due to the fact that the treatise simply equated the Eleusinian family with the κήρυκες and both with the μάγειροι, because in the Epos the κήρυκες and the μάγειροι have partly the same functions. Therefore  
 5 Wilamowitz is apparently right in his correction of F 5b<sup>2</sup>). K. (in a description of Eleusis?) gave a concise sketch of the functions of the Kerykes. It is quite out of the question that he should have noted the lowering of the prestige of the μάγειροι<sup>3</sup>). In the *Atthis*, which was so succinct, detailed accounts of any kind must not be expected; these were  
 10 to be found in the later books *Περὶ γενῶν* and *Περὶ θυσιῶν*.

(6) Zenob. *Prov.* I, 6; Phot. Berol. p. II, 19 Rei; Eust. *II.* Δ 171 p. 461, 15. This is evidently K., not Demon<sup>1</sup>). The quotation is lost so that we cannot tell whether K. referred to the proverb or whether he only mentioned certain wells, which may perhaps have been connected  
 15 with Agamemnon by popular tales, for in K.'s account<sup>2</sup>) as in others Agamemnon came to Athens, though only on his return from Troy<sup>3</sup>). The well-known endeavour of local historians to create connexions with the pan-Hellenic Homeric tradition<sup>4</sup>) is recognizable. But if the information has any value at all it looks less like a local αἰτιον (πολλαχού τῆς  
 20 Ἑλλάδος) than a trait in the character of Agamemnon or a construction built on something of the kind<sup>5</sup>).

(7-8) The two fragments may be assumed to belong to the account of Kleisthenes' organisation of the state, which may have opened the third book. This may mean that K., like Herodotos and Hellanikos,  
 25 regarded Kleisthenes as the creator of democracy whereas (Androtion and) Aristotle ascribed this achievement to Solon. We may infer from the view of K. his fundamentally democratic attitude, which of course must have manifested itself in the account of the history of the fifth century and to a certain degree even in that of the sixth. F 21 shows that  
 30 this was actually the case. I should like to see in K. the Atthidographic authority to whom the source of Plutarch *Solon* 12 owes the decided apology for the Alcmeonids in the account of the Cylonian ἄγος. We may further infer that the absence of citations of K. for Solon is not an accident.

(7) Phot. s.v. Πυθῆ· Ἀθήνησιν ἐκκλησία· ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ πυκνοῦσθαι τὸν δῆλον  
 35 ἐκεῖ, ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ πυκνά εἶναι τὰ περὶ αὐτὴν οἰκήματα. Schol. Plat. *Krit.* 112 A; Et. M. p. 677, 45. Schol. Aristoph. *Eq.* 42... παρὰ τοῦ πυκνοῦσθαι ἐκεῖ τοὺς βουλευτάς (τὸν λαόν, τοὺς δῆλους Schol. *Thesm.* 658), ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ πεπυκνωθῆναι ταῖς καθέδραις. Lex. Patm. Demosth. 18, 55 (*BCH* I, 141) ἦτοι ἀπὸ τοῦ πυκνά ἔχειν τὰ βάρη, ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ πυκνά ἔχειν τὰ οἰκή-

ματα. Schol. Aischin. 1, 81 παρά τὸ πεπυκνωθῆναι τοῖς οἰκήσεσιν (to which is added the meaningless κατέτεμε γὰρ αὐτὴν εἰς οἰκίας ταῖς ἡλιασταῖς *scil.* Τιμαρχος). Lex. rhet. p. 292, 30 Bkr ὅτι πυκνά ἐστι περὶ αὐτὴν τὰ οἰκήματα. It appears certain that K. is speaking of the assembly of the people (subject: οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι) which came together on the Pnyx <sup>1)</sup>, and that he explained the name in passing. But owing to his concise manner of speaking it is less certain whether he wished Pnyx to be understood as 'the whole line of the hills from Philopappos to the hill of the Nymphs' <sup>2)</sup> or only the Pnyx in the narrower sense, the place for the <sup>10</sup> Assembly, the position of which has now been fixed by the ὄρος-stone I G<sup>2</sup> I 882 <sup>3)</sup>. But the derivation of the name from the massing of houses <sup>4)</sup> makes the first meaning probable. About the extension of building in the western part of the city and its date see Judeich *Topogr.* <sup>3</sup> p. 54; 389 ff. From the statements of K. it seems improbable that he was thinking <sup>15</sup> of the distant past, although in his time the depopulation of the residential quarters had already begun <sup>5)</sup>; and, quite certainly, he was not speaking of the arranging of the space for the Assembly; the ὄρος-stone proves that 'the place had been delimited long before 445 B.C.' <sup>6)</sup>. It seems impossible to state anything more definite <sup>7)</sup>.

<sup>20</sup> (8) The lexicographer explains the obsolete term ναυκραρία by comparing with δῆμος and συμμορία, the three obviously meaning to him the three groups which successively supplied the Athenian fleet. This notion is wrong, because the demes never had this function. The definition is followed by two unconnected excerpts from Aristotle's Ἀθπ. <sup>25</sup> and the *Atthis* of K. The reference to the time of writing <sup>1)</sup>, which is so important for the fixing of K.'s date <sup>2)</sup>, belongs to the second excerpt. According to Aristotle and the general tradition Kleisthenes replaced the naukrariai of Solon or of the time before him <sup>3)</sup>—each of which δύο (δέκα Wilamowitz) ἑπέτας παρείχε καὶ ναῦν μίαν, ἀφ' ἧς ἴσως ὠνόμαστο <sup>4)</sup> <sup>30</sup>—by the demes, and the naukraroi by the demarchoi; according to K. he only altered their numbers: in place of the 48 naukrariai of Solon <sup>5)</sup> he established 50, corresponding to the ten phylai <sup>6)</sup>. It would hardly be well to level out the difference of the conceptions and the numbers <sup>7)</sup>; I should prefer to combine the unique statement of K. with certain <sup>35</sup> numbers in Herodotos, according to whom (1) Kleisthenes δέκα τε δῆ φυλάρχους ἀντὶ τεσσέρων ἐποίησε, δέκα (δέκαχα Lolling) δὲ καὶ τοὺς δῆμους κατένειμε ἐς τὰς φυλάς <sup>8)</sup>, which can only mean that Herodotos' authority gave him the total of 100 demes; (2) the Athenian fleet in the war with Aegina, that is before the law concerning the fleet carried by

Themistokles, counted 50 ships <sup>9)</sup>. Herodotos does not expressly mention this number, but one gets at it by an easy sum of subtraction, *viz.* by taking from the 70 ships manned by the Athenians the 20 borrowed from Corinth. Whether the number is historically correct <sup>10)</sup>, and what 5 is the fact as to the 70 ships demanded by Miltiades for the expedition to Paros <sup>11)</sup>, is of no importance here. But the explanation of K.s 50 Cleisthenian naukrariai as merely inferred from the number of ships given by Herodotos 6, 89 <sup>12)</sup> appears quite incredible to me. What we hear from Herodotos and K. looks much more like a complete account 10 of the reforms of Kleisthenes seen from the angle of a certain institution and its purpose which, again, corroborates the view that K., when speaking of the 100 symmories, means the trierarchic symmories. I shall leave unasked the historical question whether K.s account is founded on knowledge of the facts, or whether it applies a theory about Kleisthenes: to 15 attempt an answer would, in this place, lead us too far. But if the assertions of K. are historically correct then they prove that Kleisthenes was not particularly interested in the fleet and that he mainly left the old order as it was <sup>13)</sup>. Nor is this very surprising: the Athens of Kleisthenes is throughout a hoplite state, and the tradition about Themistokles 20 as the great beginner of the navy is well founded and certain. It must have been he who did away with the naukrariai, 'these wholly obsolete formations, in favour of the trittyes, as found in the constitution of Kleisthenes' <sup>14)</sup>. It may have been different with the structure of the army; but we do not know anything of this. The position of the strategoi 25 was not altered till about 501/0 B.C. <sup>15)</sup>; and there remain doubts as to whether by Kleisthenes himself.

(9) This fragment seems to belong to a historical account, but its context cannot be known. The πομπή and sacrifice in memory of Marathon are not to be thought of, since these were in honour of Artemis Agrotera <sup>1)</sup>, 30 not of the Meter. For the Metroon <sup>2)</sup> of the Μητήρ ἐν Ἄγρας <sup>3)</sup> and the cults in Agrai see Moebius *A M* 60/1, 1935/6, p. 231 ff.; Nilsson *Gesch. d. griech. Religion* I, 1941, p. 633.

(10) It remains doubtful how far one may supplement Pausanias' incomplete excerpt from K. from Plutarch (*Nikias* 13) who, with the 35 introductory words καίτοι λέγεται πολλά καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἱερῶν ἐναντιοῦσθαι πρὸς τὴν στρατείαν, interrupts the events and discussions in Athens by the account of the Delphic omen: ἐν δὲ Δελφοῦς Παλλάδιον ἔστηκε χρυσοῦν ἐπὶ φοίνικος χαλκοῦ βεβηκός, ἀνάθημα τῆς πόλεως ἀπὸ τῶν Μηδικῶν ἀριστείων· τοῦτ' ἔκοπτον ἐφ' ἡμέρας πολλὰς προπετόμενοι κόρακες, καὶ τὸν

καρπὸν ὄντα χρυσοῦν τοῦ φοίνικος ἀπέτρωνον καὶ κατέβαλλον. The details are slightly different in *De Pyth. or.* 8 p. 397 F ἐν δὲ τοῖς Σικελικοῖς τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἀτυχήμασιν αἱ τε χρυσαῖ τοῦ φοίνικος ἀπέρρεον βάλανοι, καὶ τὴν ἀσπίδα τοῦ Παλλαδίου κόρακες περιέκοπτον. Because of the criticism in ch. 1, I am not inclined to derive *Nik.* 13 from Timaios <sup>1)</sup>: Timaios, according to Plutarch, who disapproves of his δεινότης, makes of the simple premonitions pegs on which to hang subtleties very characteristic of him; for instance, he connects the outrage on the Herms, alone mentioned as τοῦ ἔκπλου οἰωνός by Thukydides 6, 27 <sup>2)</sup>, with the name of Hermokrates. K. is much more simple, following the fashion which was becoming more prevalent in the fourth century of narrating many omens and preferably those observed at Delphi. The most famous, though probably later, example of this is Kallisthenes' treatment of the battle at Leuktra <sup>3)</sup>. Did Pausanias, when speaking of κακοῦργοι καὶ φῶρες ἄνθρωποι mean Philomelos and his associates, to whom his Delphic source may have attributed the spoliation of this anathema also? That he had a source from Delphi for his tenth book (Istros may have been the connecting link) seems to me certain; this would not exclude autopsy (ἑθεώμην) of the votive gift, strongly maintained by G. Daux, *Pausanias à Delphes* 20 p. 185 f.

(11) The fragment sounds like an annual entry; but this impression may be deceiving. At any rate it is not the account of the institution of a cult, rather the description of a cult or regulations for those entitled to celebrate it. It probably refers to the Marathonian cult, which Philochoros also mentioned <sup>1)</sup>, not to that in Kynosarges, for here some particular statements ought to have been made about the παράσιτοι <sup>2)</sup>.

(12) Either this quotation combines two glosses, or after ἐβδ. β. the name of an author who had mentioned the proverb is missing: Zenobios (Miller *Mélanges* p. 357) gives Philemon and Poseidippos; μνημονεύειν is the usual term in notes about proverbs; the parallel tradition excludes any considerable alteration of the text. K. is quoted only for the fact that the pastry (sometimes called σελήνη) was offered to Selene. Whether he called it βοῦς merely or βοῦς ἐβδομος, and whether he explained the expression <sup>1)</sup>, cannot be made out. Pollux 6, 76 πέλανοι δὲ κοινοὶ

35 πᾶσι θεοῖς, ὡς αἱ σελῆναι τῆι θεῶι· κέλκηνται δ' ἀπὸ τοῦ σχήματος, ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ βοῦς· πέμμα γάρ ἐστι κέρατα ἔχον μεμιμημένα, προσφερόμενον Ἀπόλλωνι καὶ Ἀρτέμιδι καὶ Ἑκάτῃ καὶ Σελήνῃ <sup>2)</sup>. Hesych. s.v. βοῦς· πόπανόν τι τῶν θυομένων οὕτως <καλούμενον> ἐν ταῖς ἀγιότηταις Ἀθήνησι θυσίας <sup>3)</sup>. ἦν δὲ βοὶ παραπλήσιον. Phot. s.v. σελήνη· πόπανον ὁμοιον τῶι



ἀστέρι· τὸ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ σελήνης καὶ ἐπισηλῆμιον καὶ ἀρεστήρ<sup>4)</sup> καὶ βοῦς  
 καλεῖται. Eustat. II. p. 1165, 4 (Suda s.v. ἀνάστατοι, s.v. β. ἔβδ. gl. 2;  
 s.v. σελῆναι; Hesych. s.v. ἔβδ. βοῦς) βοῦς παρά παλαιοῖς ἐλέγτο καὶ τι  
 πέμματος εἶδος, ἐφ' οὗ παροιμία τὸ 'βοῦς ἔβδομος' ἔχουσα λόγον τοιόνδε·  
 5 σελῆναι πέμματα ἦσαν πλατέα κυκλοτερῆ, ἐπὶ δὲ ἐξ σελήναις τοιαύταις  
 βοῦν, φασίν, ἔβδομον ἔπεττον (ἐπεθύετο οὗτος ἔβδομος, ὡς Εὐθυκλῆς ἐν  
 Ἄταλάντη Sud), κέρατα ἔχοντα κατὰ μίμησιν πρωτοφαοῦς (Sud -φουοῦς  
 Eust) σελήνης . . . ὁ δὲ ταῦτα ἱστορήσας Παισαυτίας<sup>5)</sup> λέγει καὶ ὅτι αἱ  
 ῥηθεῖσαι σελῆναι . . . καὶ πέλανοι ἐλέγοντο, καὶ ὅτι πεμμάτων εἶδος καὶ  
 10 οἱ ἀνάστατοι πλακοῦντες καὶ οἱ χαρίσιοι καὶ οἱ ἀμφιφῶντες κτλ. Zenob.  
 Miller *Mélanges* p. 357 (*ibid.* p. 377; Diogen. *Prov.* 3, 50; Suda s.v.  
 β. ἔ. gl. 1) βοῦς ἔβδομος· ἐπὶ τῶν ἄγαν ἀναισθήτων. πλάττεται γὰρ παρά  
 Ἀθηναίους ὅλον σμήγμα τετράγωνον ἐξ ἀλεύρων, ὃ μετὰ ποπάνων ἔνιοι<sup>6)</sup>  
 καθαγιαζοῦσι, καὶ φασιν ἴσον ἱερείῳ τῷ μεγίστῳ. δύναται δὲ βοῦς ἔβδομος,  
 15 ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν ἀναισθητὸν εἶναι δοκεῖ τὸ ζῶιον, ἐπισκώπτοντες τοὺς ἀνόη-  
 τούς ἐκάλουν βοῦν· ἔβδομον δέ, ἐπειδὴ τὰ ἐμψυχα ἐξ ἔθουοι οἱ πένητες<sup>7)</sup>,  
 πρόβατον ὅν αἰγα ὄρνιν βοῦν χῆνα<sup>8)</sup> καὶ ἔβδομον τὸν πεττόμενον (Stengel;  
 πετεινόν p. 357; πέμμα εἰς σχῆμα βοὸς πλασθέν p. 377; ὁ ἐξ ἀλεύρου Sud)  
 βοῦν<sup>9)</sup>. μέμνηται τῆς παροιμίας Φιλῆμων ἐν Φυλακῆι καὶ Ποσειδίππος ἐν  
 20 Ἀρσινῆι.

(13) The quotation ends at Ἀτθίδι; then the discussion about the  
 name is continued<sup>1)</sup>. To this belongs also the reference to Homer cited  
 by the scholiast, not by K. Thukyd. I, 6, 3 καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι αὐτοῖς  
 (*scil.* τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις) τῶν εὐδαιμόνων διὰ τὸ ἀβροδίατον οὐ πολὺς χρόνος  
 25 ἐπειδὴ χιτῶνάς τε λινοῦς ἐπαύσαντο φοροῦντες . . . ἀφ' οὗ καὶ Ἰώνων τοὺς  
 πρεσβυτέρους κατὰ τὸ ξυγγενὲς ἐπὶ πολὺ αὕτη ἡ σκευὴ κατέσχευ· μετρία  
 δ' αὖ ἐσθῆτι καὶ ἐς τὸν νῦν τρόπον πρῶτοι Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἐχρήσαντο.  
 That K. was not dependent on him for observations like that of our frag-  
 ment is shown by Herodot. 5, 88, who connects the exchanging by Athe-  
 30 nian women of the ἐσθῆς Δωρῆς, τῆι Κορινθιαὶ παραπλησιωτάτη, for the  
 λίνεος κιθῶν, the Ἰὰς ἐσθῆς<sup>2)</sup>, with an occurrence in the dim old times  
 of the war with Aegina. But besides Herodotus the entire ethnography  
 as well as later history, pays attention to clothing, especially of the  
 luxurious kind. The literature comparing Hellenic customs with those  
 35 of the barbarians was already considerable at the date of K. It is note-  
 worthy that K. compares the dress with that of three oriental peoples  
 instead of deriving it from the Karians mentioned by Herodotus in this  
 connexion. Whether he explained it, and if so how, we do not know; it is  
 not said that he found 'a proof in the long skirts worn by the Athenian

priests and to be seen in every work of archaic art' <sup>3</sup>). Nor is it clear where Thukydides looked for the origin of the old robes though he evidently regards τὸ ἀβροδιαυρον as a relic of barbarism.

(14) The 'Εξηγητικόν, from which we infer that K. was an exegetes <sup>1</sup>),  
 5 dealt with the rites of the various ceremonies, and this naturally deter-  
 mined the arrangement of the work. I ventured a conjecture about the reason  
 for publishing these matters in *Atthis* p. 75 f. If it is correct we may  
 perhaps assume explanations in a certain measure, and some fragments  
 without the title of a book may be from the *Exegetikon*; but we cannot  
 10 prove this. The lexicographer Dorotheos <sup>2</sup>) illustrates the gloss ἀπόνημμα  
 from two spheres: ἀπόνημμα in the cult of the dead he quotes from K.,  
 the purification of λέεται from the Εὐπατριδῶν πάτρια. He copies those  
 sentences only in which the words occur that interest him, but he gives  
 the connexion in which they were used. They are purely ritual prescrip-  
 15 tions. The one taken from K. may have been a form to be filled in with  
 the appropriate names unless οἷς χρηὶ καὶ θέμις is merely a religious  
 precaution such as is familiar to us from Roman formularies. It is on this  
 alternative that the answer to the question depends whether we may  
 recognize an early verse, at least in the formula accompanying the li-  
 20 bation <sup>3</sup>). I am also doubtful whether ὕμῶν refers to the dead of the  
 family tomb or to the gods of the underworld, and I shall not take part  
 in the dispute between Stengel and Eitrem <sup>4</sup>) about the interpretation  
 of the rite. In any case, the rite described here is meant for a sacrifice  
 at an established grave, not as part of the funeral. The fact that βόθυνος  
 25 occurred in Solon's laws <sup>5</sup>), even if it was in the funeral ordinances, does  
 not justify the assumption <sup>6</sup>) that 'K. appealed to the κύρβεις of Solon',  
 and it is absurd to infer from Plutarch. *Solon* 10, 4 <sup>7</sup>) that the injunction  
 to dig the βόθυνος πρὸς ἐσπέραν and to look towards the west also 'goes  
 30 back to Solon'. The religious custom, fixed and followed here by the exe-  
 getai, is founded, of course, on the idea that the country of the dead  
 is in the west; and this conception is certainly far older than Solon.

(15) K. gave an account of the marriages of the eldest two sons of  
 Peisistratos after the return from the (first) exile which he narrated in  
 the same way as Herodotos 1, 60 <sup>1</sup>). This connexion with the return  
 35 explains why Hipparchos here precedes Hippias, and ἐξέδωκεν δὲ καὶ  
 implies that the marriage of the tyrant himself with the daughter of  
 Megakles <sup>2</sup>) had been narrated before. It is uncertain how far the quota-  
 tion extends. The subject of φησί p. 55, 21 may, or may not, be K. If it  
 was not K., but Phylarchos mentioned by Athenaios just before <sup>3</sup>),

he was giving a catalogue of marriages made with a view not to suitability of rank but to beauty, and this seems possible. But it is equally possible that the epitomator has confused things, and that the title, impossible for K. <sup>4</sup>), ἐν ἡ Νόστων, belongs to φησί, the subject being then Antikleides, whom Athenaios repeatedly quotes. In any case, the account of K. belongs to the second book of the *Atthis*. K. is, in details about persons, better informed than Herodotos, who also obtained his material in Athens. He calls Phye, who played the part of Athena in the dramatic return, the daughter of Sokrates, which means that she is a citizen <sup>5</sup>).

<sup>10</sup> Her father may have been one of the followers of Peisistratos, and we see from ἐξέδωκεν that he must have been dead, perhaps killed in a fight when marching into the town <sup>6</sup>), and that Peisistratos regarded himself as the guardian of the girl. Hippias was given the daughter of the polemarch Charmos <sup>7</sup>). Her name must have been mentioned as well as that

<sup>15</sup> of Phye. But it is not to be got out of λαβεν which corresponds to ἐξέδωκεν. The term is quite correct <sup>8</sup>), nor does it mean that Hippias was not yet of age for marriage <sup>9</sup>), though he may, in fact, not have been; that the father chooses the wife for the son is the usual thing <sup>10</sup>). The missing name is to be supplied from Thukyd. 6, 55, 1 Ἰππίου δὲ πέντε, οἱ αὐτῷ

<sup>20</sup> ἐκ Μυρρίνης τῆς Καλλίου τοῦ Ὑπεροχίδου (C -εχ- ρ) ἐγένοντο. The suggestion made to me by H. T. Wade-Gery that Thukydidēs in the στήλη had misread Καλλίου for Χάρμου appears to me the more credible as the name Hyperochides does not occur in the family of the Kerykes; the father of Kallias, who took the risk of buying the property of banished

<sup>25</sup> Peisistratos, was Phainippos <sup>11</sup>). Considering the state of names in the text of Thukydidēs, a simple corruption of Χάρμου <sup>12</sup>) into the more common Καλλίου might equally well be supposed. We cannot very well doubt that there existed a family tradition concerning these connexions by marriage as well as documentary evidence. A son of this marriage

<sup>30</sup> was Peisistratos <sup>13</sup>) who, probably, was archon in 522/1 B.C. <sup>14</sup>). It is simply a mistake when Schol. Aristoph. *Eq.* 449 calls Myrrhine the wife of Peisistratos and mother of Hippias and Hipparchos; and the same is probably the case with Myrrhine θυγάτηρ Πεισιστράτου who appears in Schol. Patm. Dem. 23, 71 <sup>15</sup>). Further, no one will suppose the father

<sup>35</sup> of Phye <sup>16</sup>) to have been invented by K. or somebody else. His being unknown to Herodotos <sup>17</sup>) is just as unimportant as the doubt on her place of origin: according to Herodotos she comes from the 'deme' Paionia <sup>18</sup>), according to ἐνιοι <sup>19</sup>) in Aristotle *Ἀθπ.* 14, 4 ἐκ τοῦ Κολλυτοῦ. A decision on this point cannot be reached, K. having mentioned merely

Φύη ἢ Σωκράτους, which he may have done either in order to correct Herodotos, since he knew that there were no 'demes' before Kleisthenes, or because for a woman the name of her father or of her husband was always sufficient. 'Kollytos' may be a mistake <sup>20</sup>), or it may have been meant to defame Phye, the reputation of this popular residential quarter not being above reproach <sup>21</sup>). But I believe it to be certain that the variant 'Αθπ. 14, 4 concerns her home only, not her social position: the στεφανόπωλις, unknown to Herodotos and K. <sup>22</sup>), has no name in Athenaios, and in Aristotle one must not connect ἐκ Κολλυτοῦ στεφανόπωλιν <sup>10</sup> Θραιτίταν; the last two words are an insertion disturbing the connexion and may originally have been a marginal note <sup>23</sup>). Those acquainted with Athenian political literature will not be surprised at the wife of Hipparchos having been made a nameless Thracian: many noble Athenians were provided (by unfriendly rumors?) with Thracian or otherwise barbarian <sup>15</sup> wives or mothers <sup>24</sup>). The source of Athenaios, who omits the Θραιτίτα, may have perceived the contradiction. "Ἐρωτα] Pausan. I, 30, I πρὸ δὲ τῆς ἐσόδου τῆς ἐς Ἀκαδημίαν ἐστὶ βωμὸς Ἐρωτος ἔχων ἐπίγραμμα ὡς Χάρμος Ἀθηναίων πρῶτος Ἐρωτι ἀναθείη. Plut. Solon I, 7 λέγεται δὲ καὶ Πεισιστρατος ἔραστής Χάρμου γενέσθαι, καὶ τὸ ἄγαλμα τοῦ Ἐρωτος <sup>20</sup> ἐν Ἀκαδημαίαι καθιερωῖσαι, ὅπου τὸ πῦρ ἀνάπτουσιν οἱ τὴν ἱερὰν λαμπάδα διαθέντες. The statement as to the dedication is more likely to be due to mistake than to corruption <sup>25</sup>). The compromise of supposing the statue set up by Peisistratos and the altar by Charmos, with the alteration "Ἐρωτος βωμὸν in the quotation from K., seems incredible; for πρῶτος, <sup>25</sup> not extant in the inscription <sup>26</sup>); appears to be polemical. As the epigram mentions neither the reason for the dedication nor the object of affection, one may well be sceptical about the love affair between the polemarch and his son-in-law-to-be Hippias, and even about the identification of the dedicator with the polemarch. But to declare K.'s statement that <sup>30</sup> the tyrant Hippias was the son-in-law of the polemarch Charmos to be 'wrong' <sup>27</sup>) is a fatally arbitrary assertion.

(16) Hesych. s.v. ἀπεδον (s.v. ἢ πεδίζειν)· ὁμαλόν, ἰσάπεδον, ἐπίπεδον. The subject is evidently the Pelasgians, or the Pelasgo-Tyrrhenians: <sup>35</sup> ὅτι Ἐκαταῖος (I F 127) . . . ἔφησε . . . ἐπεὶ τε γὰρ ἰδεῖν τοὺς Ἀθηναίους τὴν χώραν, τὴν σφι[σιν] αὐτοῖ[σιν] ὑπὸ τὸν Ἰμνησσὸν ἐοῦσαν ἔδοσαν οἰκῆσαι (scil. τοῖς Πελάσγοις) μισθὸν τοῦ τείχεος τοῦ περὶ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν ποτε ἐληλαμένου. Pausan. I, 28, 3 τῇ δὲ ἀκροπόλει, πλὴν ὅσον Κίμων ὠκοδόμησεν αὐτῆς ὁ Μιλτιάδου, περιβαλεῖν τὸ λοιπὸν λέγεται τοῦ τείχεος Πελασγούς οἰκῆσαντάς ποτε ὑπὸ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν· φασὶ δὲ Ἀγρόλαν καὶ Ὑπέρβιον <sup>1</sup>)

<τούς οἰκοδομήσαντας εἶναι> <sup>2)</sup>. πυνθανόμενος δὲ οἷτινες ἦσαν οὐδὲν ἄλλο  
 ἐδυνάμην μαθεῖν ἢ Σικελούς τὸ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὄντας † Ἀκαρνανίαν μετοικῆσαι.  
 Dion. Hal. A. R. I, 28, 4 Μυρσίλος (477 F 9) . . . τούς Τυρρηνοὺς φησι,  
 ἐπειδὴ τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἐξέλιπον, ἐν τῇ πλάνῃ μετονομασθῆναι Πελαργούς  
 5 (-ασγ-B) τῶν ὀρνέων τοῖς καλουμένοις πελαργοῖς εἰκασθέντας . . . καὶ  
 τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις τὸ τεῖχος τὸ περὶ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν τὸ Πελαργικὸν (-ασγ- B)  
 καλούμενον τούτους περιβαλεῖν. Schol. Aristoph. Av. 832 Ἀθήνησι τὸ  
 Πελαργικὸν τεῖχος ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει, οὐ μέμνηται Καλλιμάχος <sup>3)</sup> «Τυρσηνῶν  
 τεῖχισμα Πελαργικόν». Phot. s.v. Πελαργικόν (Lex. rhet. p. 299, 16 Bkr) ·  
 10 τὸ ὑπὸ τῶν Τυρσηνῶν κατασκευασθὲν τῆς ἀκροπόλεως τεῖχος· τούτους γὰρ  
 κληθῆναι Πελαργούς, οἷον Πελασγούς, ὡς πλάνητάς τινας· ἢ ὅτι ἰδόντες  
 αὐτοὺς πρῶτον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι συνδόνας λαμπράς περιβεβλημένους πελαργοῖς  
 εἶκασαν. K. ascribes to them the levelling of the Akropolis and the building  
 of the wall, which 'encompassed the upper edge of the Akropolis, at the  
 15 same time projecting to the west with a powerful outwork' <sup>4)</sup>. According  
 to him it had nine gates: ἐνεάπυλον not only 'may' but must be under-  
 stood as a 'predicative apposition to the proper object τὸ Πελαργικόν' <sup>5)</sup>.  
 K.'s concise way of expressing himself may allow us to refer the apposition  
 to the work of the nine gates in the west <sup>6)</sup>, 'from which alone the Akropolis  
 20 could be conveniently approached', and which therefore was in need of  
 a special fortification. By Πελαργικόν however he means the whole wall  
 like Herodotos in 5, 64 <sup>7)</sup>. His name for it is Πελαργικόν <sup>8)</sup>, as in the official  
 use <sup>9)</sup> and in earlier Athenian authors <sup>10)</sup>. The difficulty that the Πελαργι-  
 κόν was said to have been built by the Πελασγοί came to be felt by the  
 25 writers at the latest from Myrsilos and Philochoros <sup>11)</sup> onward. Even  
 to-day it cannot be overcome by superficial etymologies <sup>12)</sup>; on the con-  
 trary, there is reason for serious scruples about the connexion of Πελαργι-  
 κόν and Πελασγοί. As long as philology has not explained the name of the  
 people or proved rhotacism in Attica we cannot regard as refuted the  
 30 reasoning of Ed. Meyer <sup>13)</sup> who held that Hekataios was the first to tell  
 the Athenians the story of the Pelasgian builders, even if one believes  
 it to be more likely *a priori* that the popular etymology is earlier and that  
 Hekataios either based his story on it or simply accepted it. Whether  
 one should believe in the explanation as 'stork's nest' <sup>14)</sup> is another  
 35 matter; and in any case the observation of Ed. Meyer <sup>15)</sup> about the early  
 disappearance of the tradition is mistaken. We do not know where K.  
 mentioned the old wall <sup>16)</sup>. That he knew nothing of the buildings of  
 Kimon and Perikles, and even ascribed the fifth century work to the  
 Pelasgians, are inadmissible ideas: Pausan. I, 28, 3 and Plutarch. *Nik.*

13, 5 show that these matters were not forgotten; the former shows too that there were traditions extant about the Pelasgikon, which never means the whole citadel but always the old wall only.

(17) This passage precedes an appendix of variants about Ariadne<sup>1</sup>) and is preceded (ch. 15, 1-19, 7) by the more or less rationalized narratives of Theseus' expedition to Crete by Pherekydes 3 F 150, Demon 327 F 5, Philochoros 328 F 18 which, though they differ in some details, agree in making Theseus one of the hostages, and in combining the death of Aigeus with the return of them (ch. 21-23). Evidently Plutarch found it difficult to place the totally divergent account of K. and therefore introduced it rather vaguely. In fact, K. does not relate *ἰδίως καὶ περιττῶς* but not at all *περὶ τούτων*, unless one understands the *ταῦτα* quite generally as one sometimes must do with Plutarch in cases like this. For K. has cancelled the whole journey of the youthful Theseus with the hostages to Minos, together with the love of Ariadne, and replaced it by a later military expedition of the king Theseus against Deukalion, the son of Minos. The treaty of peace, made eventually with the queen Ariadne, includes the restoring of the hostages and eternal peace between Crete and Athens. Perhaps K. indicated by a *νῦν* that this alliance still existed in this own time. φ. 56, 1-5 ]Between this opening and the story of Daidalos Plutarch may have left out something. The *δόγμα κοινόν* was invented by K., probably not only in order to put Minos still more in the wrong in his aggression, this being a breach of an international settlement, but also in order to take from him<sup>2</sup>) and attribute to Jason the prestige of having put down piracy. One thinks that thus the first war of Minos against Athens became impossible, and that K. told the story of Androgeos in a different form from the usual if he told it at all. We do not know how he did this, and the Athenian hostages cannot be expelled from K.'s narrative. But one might refer to the strange tale Schol. Eurip. *Hipp.* 887: here Minos demands the extradition of Daidalos by ambassadors at first; then, on its being refused, he requests *διὰ γραφῆς* that victims should be sent for the Minotaur annually *ὃ δὲ καὶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἠθέλησαν*. This account is not K., for the men provided are not hostages but food for the Minotaur. But it shows even this part of the story to have had very different versions, and suggests that the story of the hostages might be possible apart from a war with Minos. That the expedition, undertaken according to K. on behalf of Daidalos, does not gain its purpose because Minos is driven to Sicily by a storm and dies there, may have been invented after Herodotos 7, 170. A storm like that is a most

convenient resource from the *Odyssey* onward, and the account of K. deals very independently with a large tradition full of contradictions. One would like to know how he accounted for all the cults, festivals, customs, which Attic tradition connects with the journey of Theseus and the hostages. That there were possibilities is shown by Plutarch *Thes.* 22, 7, where τινές are quoted for the Oschophoria or Eiresione being celebrated in remembrance of the reception of the Heraclids, not, as πλείονες contend, of the journey of the hostages. But this quotation probably does not authorize the assumption that τινές means K. *p.* 56, 6 πλοίωι] Aristot.-  
 10 Herakleid. *Pol.* 41; Palaiphatos *Apist.* 12; *al.* The flight of Daidalos to Athens and the refusal to hand him over are found also in Schol. Eurip. quoted above, but in connexion with the story of the hostages for Minos. I cannot here go into the details and the abundance of variants, which partly originated in Tragedy and treated the meagre old outline  
 15 of the tale in a very arbitrary fashion <sup>3</sup>). In K.s version everything, properly speaking, is singular, at least for us; even the pedigree of Daidalos <sup>4</sup>) who elsewhere is connected with Erechtheus through Metion <sup>5</sup>). By his being called ἀνεψιός of Theseus it appears that the list of kings used by K. did not contain Kekrops II and Pandion II, or, if he knew  
 20 of them, he has left them out of account in his separate stories. *p.* 56, 8-19 ]One can easily understand why in K.s account not only the Minotaur is missing but even the Tauros of Demon and Philochoros. Theseus intends to go to Deukalion when, after returning from Thesprotia, he is refused entry to Athens under the rule of Menestheus; but a storm  
 25 drives him off to Skyros where he dies <sup>6</sup>). Hence Deukalion appears to have been inserted into the account as a friend of Theseus. Their relations are friendly also in Diodor. 4, 62 Δευκαλίων . . . δυναστεύων τῆς Κρήτης καὶ ποιησάμενος πρὸς Ἀθηναίους συμμαχίαν συνώικισε τὴν ἰδίαν ἀδελφὴν Φαίδραν Θησεΐ <sup>7</sup>). *p.* 56, 12-14] Are these the first Athenian battle-  
 30 ships? Evidently K. intends to place the Athenian sea power at the earliest possible date. That ships from Crete are lacking is not accidental <sup>8</sup>) either here or in Schol. Eurip. *l.c.* *p.* 56, 17-21] Is this simply the consequence of K.s inverting the whole tale of Theseus and Minos? Does he also intend to remove the objectionable 'rape' <sup>9</sup>) of Ariadne  
 35 and Theseus' breach of faith <sup>10</sup>), cutting at the same time the Ariadne knot? We must certainly not nowadays with Weber, Burn, Myres and others find in these tales 'definite historical events', a 'rise of Athens' sea power' which 'puts an end to the hegemony of Crete'. Herter *Rh. Mus.* 85, 1936, p. 216, does not, in my opinion, reject these ideas with sufficient energy.

(18) To the quotation from K. we shall have to add very probably the cultic facts in § 2/3 and 7, on which he based his conclusions. The part quoted refers only to the big battle which decided the issue <sup>1)</sup>, that is the battle succeeded by the *συνθήκαι* brought about by Theseus' Amazon wife Hippolyte <sup>2)</sup>, whether immediately or after a more extensive siege of the Amazons' camp on the Areopagos. If the battle was fought on Boedromion 6th(?) and the Amazon sacrifice offered on Pyanepsion 7th 'before the Theseia' <sup>3)</sup> the fighting lasted one month. If *τετάρτωι μηνί* is correct the Amazons had been in Attica before that for three months <sup>4)</sup>.

<sup>10</sup> So far the conception of U. Koehler <sup>5)</sup> that the Amazons 'laid siege to the citadel from the Areopagos, until it was relieved by the reinforcements of the neighbouring communities in Melite and the upper Ilissos' is certainly more correct than the 'analysis' of Wilamowitz <sup>6)</sup> who, in my opinion, has treated arbitrarily, and fundamentally misinterpreted, <sup>15</sup> the account of K. He brings the wall of the city into K.'s narrative, this being absolutely out of the question if only because of the wording in § 4 and the *ῥῶν* in it; and he makes a defeat out of the victory. In fact K. says that the Athenians attacked from the west and the Museion the right wing of the Amazons which was supported by the Pnyx; and that <sup>20</sup> they were driven out of the town, suffering heavy losses, *μέχρι τῶν Εὐμενίδων* <sup>7)</sup>. In the east, however, their attack starting from the Palladion, Ardettos and the Lykeion drives the left wing of the Amazons <sup>8)</sup> back to their camp. It is said in § 2 that the Athenians are attacking, not the Amazons, as Wilamowitz has it; the battle line runs from west to east, <sup>25</sup> and the Amazons face south. If in the tale of the Amazons a remembrance is extant of the conditions 'before the *συννοικισμός*' when 'the settlement on the hill of the citadel still was a community in itself' and the hill of Ares 'by its very situation offered the natural and only base for an attack against it' <sup>9)</sup>, then K. had no longer a 'clear conception' of <sup>30</sup> this state of things; on the contrary, his account, copied by Plutarch because of the *ἐξακριβοῦν τὰ καθ' ἕκαστα* <sup>10)</sup>, replaces the simple old contrast of Areopagos and Akropolis <sup>11)</sup> by the town of the 5/4th century. The reason for this was recognized long ago <sup>12)</sup>; only the inferences with regard to the interpretation of K. have not been drawn: his purpose is <sup>35</sup> to bring into a historical, which means for him rational, context the memorials of the Amazons scattered over the city, and (we must not forget) the dates of the festival calendar. It is not clear, and in my opinion not even probable, that he supposed the battle to have been fought for the 'relief' of the citadel. But it is noteworthy and remarkable that, after



having so boldly transformed the story of Minos in favour of Athens, he should not have made the battle with the Amazons a complete triumph of Athens as the rhetors of the fourth century did: the contest ends with a treaty, while Lysias *Epit.* 6/8 and Isokrates *Paneg.* 168/70<sup>13</sup>) make it a complete annihilation of the attackers, and its consequence the fall of the empire of the Amazons<sup>14</sup>). What induced K. to write as he did appears in § 7. Hence we may infer that the tale was old (earlier than the sixth century) and the cult tradition firmly established, whatever the facts behind it<sup>15</sup>). That the campaign of Theseus against the Amazons is merely a later motivation has generally been agreed<sup>16</sup>). *p.* 56, 26 Φόβωι] An old feature. In the battle of Marathon Pan has already taken his place<sup>17</sup>). *p.* 56, 27 Βοηδρόμια] even if one does away with ἐφ' (but it is more likely to be a vestige of the number of the day, which can hardly be dispensed with) there remains the fact of K.s referring the festival to the battle of the Amazons. It is certainly not a 'confusion with the Epitaphia'<sup>18</sup>). Philochoros 328 F 13/4 dates the war of the Amazons in the period of the kings, as also the Thracian attack of Eumolpos, which is often connected with it. The heortological connexion of the festival with the sacrifice for the victory of Marathon is not certain: a connexion between the events does not exist. *p.* 56, 30 Ἀμαζόνειον] The place of the camp: Aischylos; Diodor. 4, 28, 2<sup>19</sup>) κατήντησαν εἰς τὴν Ἀττικὴν, καὶ κατεστρατοπέδευσαν ὅπου νῦν ἐστὶ τὸ καλούμενον ἐπ' ἐκείνων Ἀμαζόνειον. It is called ἱερόν by Ammonios 361 F 4; τόπος ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ, ἐνθα Θησεύς τῶν Ἀμαζόνων ἐκράτησεν by Steph. Byz. s.v. It is situated at the foot of, or on, the Areopagos<sup>20</sup>): *Bibl.* *Epit.* 1, 16 διὰ ἐστρατευσαν ἐπ' Ἀθήνας Ἀμαζόνες, καὶ στρατοπέδευσαμένας αὐτάς περὶ τὸν Ἄρειον πάγον Θησεύς μετὰ Ἀθηναίων ἐνίκησεν. It is called after them: Aischyl. *Eum.* 685<sup>21</sup>) πάγον δ' Ἄρειον τόνδ', Ἀμαζόνων ἔδραν σκήνας θ', δτ' ἦλθον Θησεύς κατὰ φθόνον στρατηλατοῦσαι, καὶ πόλιν νεόπολιν τῆιδ' ὑψίπυργον ἀντεπύργωσαν

30 τότε, Ἄρει τ' ἔθουον, ἐνθεν ἐστ' ἐπώνυμος πέτρα πάγος τ' Ἄρειος. *p.* 56, 31 Χρύσαν] Wachsmuth *Stadt Athen* 1, 422 ff.; A. Schultz *Rh. M.* 30, 1875, p. 529; Judeich *Topogr.*<sup>2</sup> p. 399. Even if there is a considerable probability of Plutarch's text being corrupt<sup>22</sup>) one would prefer not to do away with a name which fixes the locality, like παρὰ Χαλκιδόντος ἡρώϊον

35 or μέχρι τῶν Εὐμενίδων. Χρυσίς is the name of an Amazon on a red-figured vase in Naples. The Chryse in the story of Philoktetes and the wife of Dardanos from a tale connected with Athena<sup>23</sup>) and even the beloved of Ares in Orchomenos<sup>24</sup>) are of hardly any use, the name occurring too often. *p.* 56, 33 τάφους τῶν πεσόντων] Tombs near the Peiraieus

- Gate <sup>25</sup>) are not situated 'near' the Amazeion <sup>26</sup>) nor could they be according to the description of the battle. As the Athenians are at an disadvantage here, at least the possibility must be left open that K. interprets old tombs as being those of fallen Athenians. The words
- 5 θήκαις τῶν πεσόντων in the first sentence would not contradict this suggestion because they might be used comprehensively. The only Amazon tomb in Athens the position of which we know <sup>27</sup>) was originally also anonymous, viz. the Ἀμαζονίς στῆλη near the Itonian Gate <sup>28</sup>), that is quite away from the Areopagos, in the south-east <sup>29</sup>). Pausan. 1, 2, 1
- 10 calls it Ἀντιόπης μνήμα, and the mention of it in § 6 is not taken from K. but from another Attidographer <sup>30</sup>), for according to K. the wife of Theseus did not fall in battle. But the anonymous tomb near the Itonian Gate suits the fight on the other wing, and K. may even have inferred from that tomb the direction of the attack. p. 57, 6 Ἰπολύτης]
- 15 The excerpt is so scanty that it is not clear whether Hippolyte was already the wife of Theseus when the Amazons attacked. If she was K. must have related the journey of Theseus to the Pontos. But as the name of K. is missing in the nest of quotations Plutarch. *Thes.* 26, 1 no certainty can be reached: according to Philochoros 328 F 110 καὶ τινες ἄλλοι Theseus
- 20 went with Herakles, according to 'most authors' <sup>31</sup>) he went at a later date and ἰδιόστολος. The *Attides* may have differed concerning this as well as concerning the name of the Amazon: Philochoros <sup>32</sup>) seems to have had Antiope which has become the usual version; Istros <sup>33</sup>) gave the name of Hippolyte and asserts her to have been raped. This would put
- 25 the guilt of the war with the Amazons on Theseus and Athens, a consequence avoided by Lysias *Epitaph.* 4/6. Isokrates <sup>34</sup>), however, makes Hippolyte fall in love with Theseus and follow him, and the Amazons go to war ἐφ' Ἰπολύτην τὴν τοὺς νόμους παραβᾶσαν τοὺς παρ' αὐταῖς κειμένους. As for K., here also we do not know his version. p. 57,
- 30 13/6] The Ὀρκωμόσιον is mentioned here only; about the sacrifice to the Amazons, 'certainly old ἐναγίσματα', see Herter *Rh. Mus.* 85 p. 220 n.4.
- (19) If an Attic author, about the year 350 B. C., speaks of a couple Xuthos-Kreusa, one would first think of the parents of Ion from whom the Athenians derived the name of Ionians and their Ἀπόλλων πατρῷος <sup>1</sup>).
- 35 This Kreusa, in the tradition of the *Attides* and Ephoros, is the daughter of Erechtheus <sup>2</sup>). On the other hand, the daughter of the Corinthian Kreon is, in Euripides as well as on the Medeia vase <sup>3</sup>), anonymous. Anaxikrates 307 F 2 and others call her Glauke, the Romans alone call her Creusa <sup>4</sup>), either according to a Hellenistic tragedy, or it may be

following the scholia on Euripides. These seem to have discussed names and descent of the several Kreusas. The only version of the scholia which has come down to us, abbreviated and not quite sound, has fused the Athenian woman with the Corinthian, who is sometimes called daughter of Hippotes <sup>6</sup>). Wilamowitz *Euripides Ion*, 1926, p. 8 when writing 'in K. the wife of Xuthos was indeed Kreusa, but she was at the same time the daughter of Kreon of Corinth; her son, therefore, cannot have continued the family of Erechtheus, and probably was the king of Aigialos' brings us face to face with unanswerable questions <sup>6</sup>): (1) was the son of this marriage also called Ion? (2) was the 'king of Aigialos' the same person as the father of the Athenian Ion? (3) did K. not yet give a name to the father of this Ion? If so, would the figure of his father be later than K.? It is very improbable that K. did not know of the Athenian Ion or did away with him; that he made him the son of a Corinthian woman <sup>15</sup> is absolutely impossible. If Euripides was the first to give to the son of Apollon-Xuthos Kreusa as his mother <sup>7</sup>) or (more correctly) if he made this use of one of the daughters of Erechtheus, then K. followed him as the whole later Attic tradition did. It is very interesting that K. should have used so late a source as that, but it is not incredible, for he could not leave <sup>20</sup> the mother of Ion without a name. K.'s Xuthos cannot have been the son of Hellen or even of Aiolos; but very probably, in this tradition also, Aigeus may have been the immediate successor of Erechtheus <sup>8</sup>).

(20) Pollux 8, 118 τὸ ἐπὶ Παλλάδιω· ἐν τούτῳ λαγχάνεται περὶ τῶν ἀκουσίων φόνων. μετὰ γὰρ Τροίας ἄλωσιν Ἀργείων τινὰς τὸ Παλλάδιον <sup>25</sup> ἔχοντας Φαληρῶι προσβαλεῖν, ἀγνοῖαι δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν ἐγχωρίων ἀναιρεθέντας ἀπορριφῆναι. καὶ τῶν μὲν οὐδὲν προσήπτετο ζῶιον, Ἀκάμας δὲ ἐμήνυσεν ὅτι εἶεν Ἀργεῖοι τὸ Παλλάδιον ἔχοντες. καὶ οἱ μὲν ταφέντες Ἀγνώτες προσηγόρευθησαν τοῦ θεοῦ χράσαντος, αὐτόθι δ' ἰδρῦθη τὸ Παλλάδιον, καὶ περὶ τῶν ἀκουσίων (ἐκου- B) ἐν αὐτῷ δικάζουσιν. Schol. Aischin. 2, 87 ἐπὶ <sup>30</sup> Παλλάδιω· . . . ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἐκρίνοντο οἱ ἀκούσιοι φόνοι· οἱ δὲ ἐν τούτῳ . . . δικάζοντες ἐκαλοῦντο ἐφέται, ἐδίκαζον δὲ ἀκουσίου φόνου καὶ βουλευσεως καὶ οἰκέτην ἢ μέτοικον ἢ ξένον ἀποκτείναντι. ὠνομάσθη δ' ἐντεῦθεν Ἀργεῖοι τὸ Παλλάδιον ἔχοντες τὸ ἐξ Ἰλίου καὶ ἀπὸ Τροίας ἀνακομιζόμενοι ὠρμίσαντο Φαληροῖ, καὶ αὐτοὺς τῶν ἐγχωρίων τινὲς ἀκουσίως ἀναιροῦσιν. <sup>35</sup> μενόντων δὲ ἐπὶ πολὺν χρόνον τῶν νεκρῶν ἀδιαφθόρων καὶ ἀψάυστων ὑπὸ θηρίων, πολυπραγμονήσαντες οἱ ἐγχωριοὶ ἐγνώσαν παρ' Ἀκάμαντος ὅτι Ἀργεῖοι ἦσαν, καὶ τὸ Παλλάδιον εὐρόντες ἰδρῦσαντό τε παρὰ τῆι Ἀθηναῖ τῆι Φαληροῖ, καὶ τοὺς νεκροὺς θάψαντες δικαστήριον ἐποίησαν ἐκεῖ τοῖς ἐπὶ ἀκουσίω φόνῳι φεύγουσιν. Schol. Patm. Dem. 23, 27 (B. C. H. I p. 137): ἐφέται

ἦσαν ἄνδρες τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἢ ἐξειλεγμένοι, ἐδίκαζον δὲ τοὺς ἀκουσίους φόνους, ἐὰν  
 ξένος ἢ δοῦλος ἦν ὁ ἀναιρεθείς. ἐκλήθησαν δὲ οὕτως ἀπὸ τῆς αἰτίας. εἰς Φαλήρον τῆς Ἀττικῆς κατέπλευσαν ἀπὸ Τροίας πλείοντες  
 οἱ μετὰ Διομήδους Ἀργεῖοι· ἀγνοήσαντες δὲ αὐτοὺς τῶν ἐπιχωρίων τινὲς καὶ  
 5 ἐπιθέμενοι ὡς ληισταῖς, νυκτὸς οὐσης, τοὺς πλείστους ἀπέκτειναν. ἡμέρας δὲ  
 γενομένης ἐνεκάλουν οἱ μετὰ Διομήδους ὡς δεινὰ πεπονθότες. Ἀθηναῖοι  
 δὲ συνθήκας ἐποίησαντο καθίσει δικαστήριον ἐκ τε Ἀργείων καὶ Ἀθηναίων  
 Ἰσων· καὶ τῆς δίκης γενομένης ἀφείθησαν οἱ τὸ ἔργον δεδρακότες ὡς κατὰ  
 10 ἀγνοίαν ποιήσαντες. ἐπεὶ οὖν ἑκάτεροί τισιν ἐφῆκαν δικασταῖς περὶ τοῦ  
 πράγματος, ἐφέται ἐκ τούτου ἐκλήθησαν οἱ τῶι ἀκουσίωι δικάζοντες. (§ 71)  
 ἐπὶ Παλλαδίωι· τοῦτο τὸ δικαστήριον ἰδρύσατο Δημοφῶν ὁ Θησέως κατὰ μαν-  
 τείαν τοῦ ἐν Δελφοῖς Ἀπόλλωνος. μαθὼν γὰρ παρὰ Ἀλκμαίονος  
 Ἀργεῖου περὶ τῶν ἐν Φαλήρῳ ἀνηρημένων ἔθαψεν αὐτούς, καὶ ἰδρύ-  
 15 σατο τὸ δικαστήριον τοῦτο. ἐκλήθη δὲ ἐπὶ Παλλαδίωι ὅτι τὸ Παλλάδιον  
 ἐκ Τροίας κεκομισμένον ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀργείων τῶν περὶ Διομήδην λαβῶν ὁ  
 Δημοφῶν καὶ καταγαγὼν ἐπὶ θάλατταν καὶ ἀγνίσας διὰ τοὺς φόνους ἰδρύ-  
 σατο ἐν τούτῳ τῶι τόπῳ. ὤρισται δὲ ἐπὶ τῶι δικαστηρίῳι τούτῳ φυγῆ  
 καὶ αἰδήσις. Harpokr. s.v. ἐπὶ Παλλαδίωι (Aristot. Ἀθπ. 57, 3) ἔσχε δὲ τὸ  
 δικαστήριον τὴν τοῦ Παλλαδίου ἐπωνυμίαν καὶ οἱ δικασταὶ τὴν τῶν ἐφετῶν  
 20 ἐντεῦθεν· Ἀγαμέμνωνος μετὰ τῶν Ἀργείων σὺν τῶι Παλλαδίωι προσενεχθέν-  
 τος Ἀθήναις ἐξ Ἰλίου, Δημοφῶν ἀρπάζει τὸ Παλλάδιον καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν διακόν-  
 των ἀναίρει. Ἀγαμέμνων δὲ δυσχεράνας δίκην τὸν ἀρπάσαντα ἀπατεῖ, καὶ  
 συνίσταται τὸ δικαστήριον ἐπὶ ἢ μὲν Ἀθηναίων, ἢ δὲ Ἀργείων, οὐς ἐφέτας  
 ἐκάλεσαν διὰ τὸ παρ' ἀμφοτέρων ἐφεθῆναι αὐτοῖς τὰ τῆς κρίσεως. Lex.  
 25 rhet. p. 311, 3 Bk1 ἐπὶ Παλλαδίωι· οἱ ἀκούσιοι φόνοι ἐν τούτῳ ἐκρίνοντο.  
 φασὶ γὰρ Δημοφῶντα ἀρπάσαντα Διομήδους τὸ Παλλάδιον φεύγειν ἐφ' ἄρ-  
 ματος, πολλοὺς δὲ ἐν τῇ φυγῇ ἀνελεῖν συμπατήσαντα τοῖς ἵπποις· ἔθεν  
 πρῶτον γενέσθαι ταύτην δίκην ἀκουσίων φόνων. δικάζουσι δὲ ἐν τούτῳ  
 30 nexion as they do in F 8. It is even more important here than there to  
 make a clear distinction between the fragments themselves and the frame-  
 work of the lexicographers <sup>1</sup>). The framework is inaccurate, the case being  
 in fact not one of ἀκούσιος φόνος, but, as Phanodemos seems to have  
 had it, δίκη ξένου ἀποκτείναντι (see p. 73, 19). In K. it is a court of  
 35 arbitration, apparently not so much concerned with homicide as with the  
 carrying off of the Palladion. In other respects the difference between  
 Phanodemos and K. is even more evident: the former (and the meaning  
 of the excerpt is unmistakable in spite of its abridgement) explains the  
 establishment, name, business of the court, the latter the title of the ephetai

who came to judge in different places—at least ἐπὶ Παλλάδιου, ἐπὶ Δελφίου, ἐν Φρεάτου. He therefore cannot have given here the aition of only this place of judgement <sup>2)</sup>, but he told this story, probably in connexion with the Nostoi, in order to prove that the genuine Palladion of Troy was now in Athens. Consequently it is not by accident that K. speaks of Athens, Phanodemos of Phaleron. On the other hand it is evident that the end of the fragment is missing: the judgement of the court of the hundred men must have been mentioned. It is apparent, however, why the lexicographers broke off at this point: the hundred judges of the special court are not the regular 51 ephetes of the laws about murder established by Drakon <sup>3)</sup>; therefore they did not want the story of K. except for the explanation of the name. An earnest warning must be given against bringing the account of K. into the discussion of the problem whether originally 'the Areopagitai in conjunction with the kings decided about homicidal offences in general', whereas the ephetai 'stepping into their place in the lighter cases only, are, in comparison with the Areopagos, an innovation' <sup>4)</sup>; or against connecting it in any way whatever with the statement of Pollux <sup>5)</sup> that Draco established the ephetai. K. did not write a history of the development of Attic homicide law; it is not even certain that he enumerated anywhere the different courts of law.

φ. 57, 28 'Αγαμέμνονος] Phanodemos speaks of anonymous Argives not without a purpose <sup>6)</sup>. It is just possible that K. was the first to relate the coming of Agamemnon to Athens, in this instance also <sup>7)</sup>. In the history of the court others put Diomedes in his place: besides the passages quoted above see Lysias ἐν τῶι 'Υπὲρ Σωκράτους πρὸς Πολυκράτην λόγῳ. Schol. Aristid. III p. 320 Ddf; Pausan. I, 28, 8/9; Polyæn. *Strat.* I, 5. The last passage is remarkable because it confirms the claim of Athens to be in possession of the genuine Palladion; for it says that Demophon having received it from Diomedes as a παρακαταθήκη passed it on to ἀνδρὶ 'Αθηναίῳ καλουμένῳ Βουζύγῃ κομίζειν 'Αθήναζε <sup>8)</sup>, Agamemnon after the battle going off with the imitation. φ. 58, 2-3] The ancient derivation from ἔφεσις, ἐφίεσθαι 'to appeal' is now almost universally rejected. In the explanation of K. the notion of an unappealable decision is inherent, and now often found in the word because of Aischyl. *Pers.* 79 στυφελοῖς ἐφέταις and ἐφέτμη: 'ἐφέτης means a person who ἐφίησις or ἐφίεται, a person οἶος ἐφίεναι, that is, a person who has a power to command' <sup>9)</sup>.

(21) The story, unknown to Herodotos and very vague in its details <sup>1)</sup>, appears in two versions. Only that of Aristotle is historically possible, that

of K. being certainly anecdotic. If the event is historical neither version need originally have had a party-political tendency, and that of Aristotle could not. If the event was invented such a tendency is evident in the version of Aristotle, and in this case the other was probably the democratic answer, and then we may use F 21 for determining the political attitude of K. <sup>8</sup>). It is quite uncertain to what extent in the rest of the chapter Plutarch draws from him. The reason for which Busolt <sup>9</sup>) ascribes to him the story of the dog § 10 is futile; in § 1-3 the conception of Themistokles corresponds to that of K. in § 7 <sup>4</sup>); but the interpretation of the oracle § 3 is ascribed to Themistokles by Herodotos also <sup>8</sup>), and this entails the account of the snake of the citadel in § 1-2 <sup>6</sup>). Nothing distinctly shows whether the decree of § 4 originates from Krateros or from an *Atthis*, and if so from which. A resolution of the people must be assumed <sup>7</sup>) not so much because of Schol. Demosth. 19, 303 <sup>8</sup>) as because Herodotos <sup>15</sup> requires it <sup>9</sup>). According to his account it is certainly not impossible that Themistokles proposed that decree; but as long as the documents were not published, his being the proposer may just as possibly have been inferred from Herodotos. I cannot free myself from the idea that Nikagoras in § 5 belongs not to the psephism of Troizen but to that of Athens, <sup>20</sup> and thus may be an addition from Krateros. On the other hand, whoever invented the psephism, which I do not believe to be genuine <sup>10</sup>), may have invented also the name of the proposer.

(22) The quotation of K. occurs in an enlargement of Herodotos 9, 70 to which the total number of 1360 also belongs. The separate numbers <sup>25</sup> for the Athenians, Spartans, Tegeatans, which do not look like an invention, are the same as in Herodotos and are evidently too low (9, 61, 3; 63, 1). We cannot say whether the names of those 159 were all to be read on the tombstones on the battlefield <sup>1</sup>), the question of the tombs <sup>2</sup>) being not at all simple. Nor can we be sure whether the numbers refer only <sup>30</sup> to 'the final and decisive engagement' of the thirteenth day <sup>3</sup>) or to what Herodotos calls the *τειχομαχία*, the taking by assault of the Persian camp. If to the latter, this would explain the fact that the 52 Athenians all belonged to the same regiment. The assumption of Wilamowitz <sup>4</sup>) 'that the preference given to this regiment points to K.s belonging to the Aiantis' <sup>35</sup> seems doubtful <sup>5</sup>). What interests K. is the sacrifice to the nymphs which, even in the details, corresponds with the facts; and if the number of 52 was not attested by documents <sup>6</sup>) I would rather believe him to have inferred from the sacrifice the important part played by the Aiantis <sup>7</sup>) at Plataiai. But he may have been acquainted with the tradition of the phyle,

the special position of which is indicated by Plutarch. *Quaest. Conv.* I, 10 p. 628 F δτι περι την έν Πλαταιαῖς μάχην εὐδοκίμησεν ἡ φυλὴ μάλιστα· διδὸν καὶ ταῖς Σφραγίτισι (Xyl σφα- T) νόμφαις τὴν ἐπινίκιον καὶ πυθόχρηστον ἀπὸ τῆς Αἰαντίδαι θυσίαν εἰς Κιθαιρῶνα, τῆς πόλεως τὸ ἱερεῖον καὶ τὰ ἄλλα παρεχούσης αὐτοῖς. <sup>8</sup>) Cf. Plutarch. *Aristid.* II, 3 'Αριστείδου δὲ πέμπαντος εἰς Δελφούς, ἀνεῖλεν ὁ θεὸς 'Αθηναίους καθυπερτέρους ἔσσεσθαι τῶν ἐναντιῶν εὐχομένους τῷ Διὶ καὶ τῇ 'Ηρᾷ τῇ Κιθαιρωνίαι καὶ Πανὶ καὶ νόμφαις Σφραγίτισι.... (4)... καὶ τὸ τῶν Σφραγιτίδων νυμφῶν ἄντρον ἐν μιᾷ κορυφῇ τοῦ Κιθαιρῶνός ἐστιν, εἰς δυσμὰς ἡλίου θερινὰς τετραμμένον, ἐν ᾧ καὶ μαντεῖον ἦν πρότερον, ὡς φασὶ 10 κτλ.; Pausan. 9, 3, 9 ὑπὸ δὲ τῆς κορυφῆς (*scil.* τοῦ Κιθαιρῶνος), ἐφ' ἧς τὸν βωμὸν ποιοῦνται (§ 7), πέντε πού μάλιστα καὶ δέκα ὑποκαταβαίνοντι σταδίου νυμφῶν ἐστὶν ἄντρον Κιθαιρωνίδων, Σφραγίδιον (-γιτίδιον Clavier) μὲν ὀνομαζόμενον, μαντεύεσθαι δὲ τὰς νόμφας τὸ ἀρχαῖον αὐτόθι ἔχει λόγος.

(23-27) All these quotations, or most of them, may come from the 15 *Exegetikon* (F 14).

(23) About the Proerosia in Boedromion or Pyanepsion see Preller-Robert *Gr. Myth.* I<sup>4</sup> p. 773 n. 3; Mommsen *Feste d. Stadt Athen* p. 192 ff.; Deubner *Attische Feste* p. 68 f.; Marm. Par. p. 61 Jac; commentary on 239 A 12/3. The tradition refers (a) to the institution of the festival, 20 placed by the *Althis* used by the Marm. Par. in the earliest times under Erechtheus: ἀφ' οὗ Δημήτηρ ἀφικομένη εἰς 'Αθήνας καρπὸν ἐφ[εῦ]ρεν, καὶ Πρ[οηροσία] (suppl. J. A. R. Munro) ἐ]πράχθη πρώτη κτλ.; cf. Schol. *Aristeid.* III p. 55 Ddf θυσία ἦν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ ἀρβόσει τῆς γῆς γενομένη, ἦν 'Αθηναῖοι τότε ἔθυσαν, ὅτε παρὰ Δήμητρος τὸν σῖτον ἔλαβον; Harp. 25 *Suda* (gl. 1) 'Υπερείδης Δηλιακῶι (401b F 9). ὄνομα θυσίας; (b) to its enlargement into a festival for all Hellas. This was related apparently in detail by Lykurgos ἐν τῷ κατὰ Μενεσαίχμου (401c F 1-4), and in its several versions also involves Abaris and the εἰρεσιῶνη: Phot. s.v. *Προηροσία*; Lex. rhet. p. 294, 7 Bkr; Et. M. p. 688, 44 (abbreviated and 30 at the end corrupt); *Suda* s.v. *Προηροσία*· αἱ πρὸ τοῦ ἀροτ[ρ]οῦ γενόμεναι θυσίαι περὶ τῶν μελλόντων ἔσσεσθαι καρπῶν ὥστε τελεσφορεῖσθαι· ἐγίνετο δὲ ὑπὸ 'Αθηναίων ὑπὲρ πάντων 'Ελλήνων † ἐς (AV ἔ MG; for the further variants see Hippostratos 568 F 4). K. is quoted for the name *Προαρκτούρια* only which—even if the explanation of Mommsen *l.c.* 35 p. 194 <sup>1</sup>) that the phrase of the star fixed 'a generally intelligible term for the sending of offerings' should be correct—does not prove that K. dealt with the second phase. It is not clear whether K. himself distinctly equated the two θυσίαι, or whether the lexicographer inferred their identity, possibly from the title of each of the ceremonies <sup>2</sup>), in which case the ident-

ification may be a mistake <sup>3</sup>). If K. was relating events one may be right in thinking of the *Atthis* and the context of the Marm. Par., and in that case would come near to F 5 (book I), for the Proerosia belongs by its nature to the sacred ploughing in Eleusis as a custom, not as a festival in itself <sup>4</sup>). If, on the other hand, he was commenting on the ceremonies, the *Exegetikon* becomes probable, and in that case this work must have included the festivals of Eleusis and of the State. There is nothing to be gained from Krates (362 F 1) mentioning the *εἰρσιώνη* in *Περὶ θυσιῶν*. We know very little about the ceremonies <sup>5</sup>). Eurip. *Hik.* 27 ff. *τυγχάνω δ' ὑπὲρ χθονὸς ἀρότου προθύουσα* certainly refers to the Proerosia, but he describes an archaically simple ceremony, or only a part of it <sup>6</sup>).

(24) The *ἀπαξ εἰρημένον* means 'penthouse', 'the projecting eaves of a house' <sup>1</sup>); cf. *προοικοδόμημα τῆς συνοικίας* *Inscr. Delos* I 417 C 52 (s. II B.C.). Or could the term possibly be related to *προ(εν)οικεῖν* (τῶν *προοικούντων ἐν τῇ νήσῳ βαρβάρων* Diod. 15, 14, 1/2), and did *προοικία* exist beside *συνοικία*, *μετοικία*?

(25) The passage seems to need supplementing. Whether 'Πέαν is the right supplement remains an open question. About her being equated with the Mother of the Gods in the fifth century see Preller-Robert *Gr. Myth.* I<sup>4</sup> p. 651; Gruppe *Gr. Myth.* p. 1521; also cf. Schwenn *RE* XI col. 2270; Rapp *Rosch. Lex.* IV col. 89; 91 f.

(26) The term *αἰδρυτον καχόν* is attested by Hesych. s.v. from Kratinos' *Σερίφιοι* I 77, 209 K as referring to exiles in a foreign country; without quotation Et. M. p. 42, 10 and Synag. Lex. p. 363, 10 Bkr. Applied to the *Σεμναί* it can hardly be 'a popular designation' <sup>1</sup>); in Aristoph. *Lys.* 809 ff. *Τίμων ἦν αἰδρυτός τις ἀβάτοισιν ἐν σκώλοισι τὸ πρόσωπον περιειργμένος*, *Ἐρινύων ἀπορρώξ* it has the same meaning as in Kratinos <sup>2</sup>). One might think of the concluding scene in the *Eumenides* of Aischylos: *δέξομαι Παλλάδος ξυνοικίαν* say the Erinyes (916), and they promise their *μετοικία* (1016); until then they were *αἰδρυταί*, without a fixed abode and without a cult image <sup>3</sup>).

(27) K. evidently explains the appeal in an old hymn or prayer <sup>1</sup>) and he identifies the unknown Ὑγῆς with Dionysos. We cannot decide whether he did this on the basis of the mention of the name by Pherekydes in that writer's story of Dionysos <sup>2</sup>). The statement about the time of the cultic celebration, which must not be doubted, has to be clearly distinguished not only from the mythological explanation of Lex. rhet. p. 207, 27 Bkr <sup>3</sup>) *ἀπὸ τοῦ συμβάντος ἐπὶ τῇ γεννήσει αὐτοῦ ἕτοῦ ὕστερον ἄμβροσίαν ἐπ' αὐτῷ ὁ Ζεὺς* <sup>4</sup>), but also from the theological speculation



of Plutarch. *De Is.* 34 ὡς κύριον τῆς ὑγρᾶς φύσεως <sup>6</sup>). It is possible that F 27 belongs to the *Exegetikon* and that the prayer was a charm for providing rain <sup>6</sup>). The connexion is uncertain between this Hyes and that whom a comic poet <sup>7</sup>) counted among the θεοὶ ξενικοί; we find the latter in the cultic appeals in Demosth. *De cor.* 260: βοῶν 'εὐοῖ σαβοῖ' καὶ ἐπορχούμενος 'ὕης ἄττης ἄττης ὕης' <sup>8</sup>).

(28) Palaeographically speaking K. may be less probable than 'Ανδροτίων, who is quoted more often in connexion with Philochoros; but in view of the matter, being an exegetes, I prefer him even to Autokleides. See on Philochoros 328 F 85-88; 189-190.

(29) The supplement [Κλει]τόδημος is fairly certain, as probably all Atthidographers told of Iphigeneia who was connected with the Brauronian cult <sup>1</sup>). But even after the revision of the text by Pfeiffer (*Callimachus* II p. 57) we cannot say how K. dealt with the story, and whether there is any connexion with F 6.

(30) C. Mueller's alteration of *Callidemus* (*RE* X col. 1682), quoted for Chalkis as an older name of Euboeia, into *Clidemus* is attractive.

(31-36) It is doubtful whether these fragments <sup>1</sup>) are taken from one work. F 31/2 concerning perceptions of the senses would fit well into a book *Περὶ φύσεως*; F 35/6 look like belonging to a *Georgikon*. A book with this title is ascribed to Androtion also <sup>2</sup>). Aristotle <sup>3</sup>) knows of special agricultural literature, and F 33/4 could easily be assigned to this kind of book. They would, then, show that the practical injunctions were built on a general physical foundation. A book *Περὶ φύσεως*, with the purpose of practical applicability, would be quite as interesting as a *Γεωργικόν* with a philosophical introduction. It remains uncertain whether we may credit the Atthidographer with such a book, knowing but little about his personality and his sphere of interests <sup>4</sup>). His date is not absolutely decisive, for Theophrastos quotes the author after Anaxagoras and Diogenes in one passage, and between the two in another. His doctrine and his having been considerably drawn upon by Theophrastos would make the second half of the fourth century more likely than the first. But the author might be a son or other relative of K., not his father.

### 324. ANDROTION OF ATHENS

Androtion is one of the few Atthidographers whom we can up to a point conceive as a personality though the biographical tradition is as slight as for Phanodemos and even slighter than for Kleidemos or

Philochoros <sup>1</sup>). The short article in the Suda <sup>2</sup>) does not come from a biography proper but from a list of the pupils of Isokrates. This list probably goes back to the great biographical work of the Callimachean Hermippos who wrote at least three books *Περὶ τῶν Ἰσοκράτους μαθητῶν*; the list of Zosimos ultimately derives from the same source <sup>3</sup>). The rhetors were not interested in a man who apparently had not published his speeches <sup>4</sup>), and the contemporary historians probably did not consider his political activity sufficiently important for discussing him at length, though at least Anaximenes in the *Περὶ Φίλιππον Ἱστορίαι* seems to have introduced him as speaker in the debate about the offer of the Persian King in 344/3 B.C. <sup>5</sup>). In the fragments of Philochoros, who dealt at some length with the period during which A. was politically active, we now only find a mention of his care for the *πομπεῖα* <sup>6</sup>). But as he was a politician <sup>7</sup>) and held some minor offices <sup>8</sup>), and as he had the misfortune to come into collision with some of Demosthenes' clients, or rather with the party to which the orator attached himself at the outset of his political career <sup>9</sup>), we come upon A. in contemporary documents <sup>10</sup>) and in two of Demosthenes' speeches <sup>11</sup>), from which we get a very unfavourable and (let us say at once) very unjust picture of him. Before stating in detail what we know of his political and literary activity we must refute the distinction between A. the politician and A. the Atthidographer made by Ruhnken and Siebelis and accepted by C. Mueller, Blass, Kahrstedt and others <sup>12</sup>). In my opinion there can be no serious doubt about the identity, as the biographical tradition such as it is calls the disciple of Isokrates *Ἀνδροτίωνα τὸν τῆν Ἀθίδα γράψαντα* <sup>13</sup>), and this evidence, which reaches back to the third century B.C., is amply corroborated by a fact which only fits the politician, *viz.* that he wrote his *Atthis* in exile <sup>14</sup>). The only serious argument against the identity—indeed there are no others <sup>15</sup>)—is the observation of Blass <sup>16</sup>) that the new F 30 with its simple style and the admission of hiatus does not fit an Isocratean whom Demosthenes calls *τεχνίτης τοῦ λέγειν* and *λέγειν δυνατός* <sup>17</sup>). But apart from the possibility that F 30 paraphrases a document <sup>18</sup>) (as *e.g.* F 36 certainly does) and apart of course from the doubt whether the quotation by Didymos is really verbatim, Blass has not put the right question: he ought to have asked whether Demosthenes is alluding to the teaching of A. by Isokrates or any other professional rhetor, or whether he is simply concerned with creating a prejudice against A. in the minds of the jurors. Moreover, the tacit assumption <sup>19</sup>) that all pupils of Isokrates spoke and wrote like the

master seems to be inadmissible. For the platform-speaker this was impossible *a priori*; and as to writing like Isokrates, even leaving aside the question whether or how far A. felt himself bound by the style of his predecessors in the same *genre* <sup>20</sup>), that depended largely on the time available: he might have been able to write in the style of Isokrates if he had aspired to do so (which does not seem very probable) <sup>21</sup>), and if he could have devoted to each book as much time as the rhetor devoted to e.g. the *Panegyrikos* or the *Panathenaios*, or even the *Areopagitikos*. But A. was 65 years old when he took up writing <sup>22</sup>), and the *Atthis* <sup>10</sup> (which moreover was his first, if not his only, strictly literary work <sup>23</sup>)), comprised eight books.

I give a survey of the data known for A. He came from a distinguished and wealthy family <sup>24</sup>). His father is generally (and most probably rightly) believed to have been the moderate oligarch (I prefer to say, the conservative politician) Andron, son of Androtion, who in 411/0 B.C. belonged to the group of Theramenes and moved the psephism which led to the condemnation to death on the charge of high treason of Antiphon and his associates <sup>25</sup>). As the son was a member of the Council before 378/7 B.C. <sup>26</sup>) he must have been born before 408/7 B.C. Being the son of such a family he received, of course, a liberal education. We do not know whether his father, who was a man tinged with the new culture <sup>27</sup>), lived long enough to send him to the school of Isokrates <sup>28</sup>), nor do we know when A. entered it, or how long he studied with this master. But studying under Isokrates was the obvious thing, as this school represented <sup>25</sup> the political opinions of the wealthy and conservative class, and kept particularly near to the ideas of Theramenes, with whom Isokrates himself is said to have been in personal connexion <sup>29</sup>). We leave open the question, unanswerable for us, how far family tradition and how far the teaching of Isokrates determined the political opinions of the young man <sup>30</sup> and his later political activity. Nor am I prepared to discuss another question, *viz.* how far A. himself was fully aware of his ideological agreement with the main points of Isokrates' political programme <sup>30</sup>). But we shall enquire in due course into his political aims and standpoint, which in any case were not quite the same as those of Isokrates <sup>31</sup>). <sup>35</sup> After having left the school <sup>32</sup>), the purpose of which was the education of statesmen, A. entered political life perhaps as early as the first half of the 'eighties: the round number of Demosthenes <sup>33</sup>) is not worth much, but it is confirmed to some degree by the fact that A. was a member of the Council before 378/7 B.C. <sup>34</sup>), so that chronology at least

does not forbid the supposition that the speech of Lysias *Κατὰ Ἀνδροτίωνος* was aimed at him; but the character, the time, and the contents of the speech are completely obscure to us <sup>35</sup>). Probably in 377/6 B.C. A. was (as *ταμίαις* or rather as a member of a special board) engaged with an inventory of the stores of Athena (cult-statue, objects used in processions, votive gifts). On this occasion he brought about the making of new *πομπεῖα* and carried a decree about the administration of the holy treasure, a decree re-iterated in 346/5 B.C. <sup>36</sup>). Some time later he seems to have been a member of a board for the recovery of unpaid taxes <sup>37</sup>), an office which has caused modern writers to call him a 'shrewd financier' <sup>38</sup>). Unfortunately the date of this office, which plays a great part in the two speeches of Demosthenes, is controversial though personally I have not much doubt that 374/3 B.C. fits the case perfectly <sup>39</sup>). Subsequently we hear nothing of A. for almost twenty years; it is not until the Social War that we come upon him again, and at that time he seems to have been active in foreign policy. In 357/6 B.C. he probably held the post (hardly of much importance) of commander of the Athenian garrison in Arkesine on Amorgos <sup>40</sup>). In the next year we again find him in the Council <sup>41</sup>), and in 355/4 B.C. he may have been a member of the embassy to Maussoles <sup>42</sup>). Schwartz evidently is correct in assuming that A. 'joined the party of action led by Aristophon, which answered the threatening armaments of Artaxerxes III against Egypt and the rebels of Asia Minor by the foolhardy attempt at kindling a national war' <sup>43</sup>). This wording is rightly cautious, for the offices held by A. during these years do not favour the idea that he played a leading part and belonged, so to speak, to the war-cabinet as minister of finances (*ταμίαις τῶν θεωρητικῶν*) <sup>44</sup>). But the alliance between the moderate conservative and the radical 'democratic doctrinaire' <sup>45</sup>), was unnatural, *πολιτικά πρὸς καιρούς*, a temporary joining of forces which could hardly be of long duration. The situation requires an explanation, which can solely be found in foreign policy <sup>46</sup>). Considering the attitude of A. in 344/3 B.C. <sup>47</sup>) we may maintain with some confidence that it was just the idea of a national war against Persia which decided him to offer his services to the radical democrats. But this same action may have caused the attempt of the new government of Eubulos at removing him, for this government was generally averse to a policy of war. The party may have believed the conservative who joined Aristophon to be a renegade, even if his activity in matters of taxes belonged to a distant past, and they may have thought him doubly dangerous because he was personally blameless

and because his political aim was popular. The situation resembled that in 344/3 B.C., when he collided with Demosthenes. A formal infringement of the law about granting honours for the retiring Council <sup>48</sup>) offered the opportunity of involving A. in a trial *παρανόμων*. Demosthenes was retained for the prosecution, and made his first appearance in public life for the party of Eubulos in 355/4 B.C. <sup>49</sup>). When the attack failed he renewed it in 353/2 B.C. again with an indictment *παρανόμων* <sup>50</sup>) which he brought against A.'s helper and friend Timokrates, using against A. the affair of the ship captured by the ambassadors to Maussoles and declared a prize by the Athenian courts <sup>51</sup>). Again he failed. The two speeches belong to the weakest and most displeasing efforts of the rising politician <sup>52</sup>). We can plead at the utmost that Demosthenes undertook the prosecution not for personal or business interests <sup>53</sup>) but because as early as then he saw a real danger for Athens in the policy of war against Persia (as Isokrates did although from widely different considerations). The affair is important for us mainly because of the light it throws on A.'s political ideas: he must have believed that the way to secure or regain for Athens the position due to her in the Greek world lay in the combination of a conservative home-policy with an energetic foreign policy against Persia. This programme no doubt embraces some ideas of Isokrates as developed since the *Panegyrikos*. But the two pamphlets in particular which the orator published during the Social War, show the difference less perhaps between the two standpoints than between the two natures. The Social War roused in A. the utmost activity, because he believed the time to have come for carrying out his programme of foreign policy for the sake of which he had made an alliance with his adversaries in home politics. For Isokrates the same war conversely offered the opportunity to enter public life with his criticism of the constitution of radical democracy: not unlike the conservative party after the disaster in Sicily, he believed the time to have come for a revision of the constitution in the interests of the conservatives and of the propertied classes in particular, who were suffering under the heavy war-taxes and the claims of the fleet. Though he does not renounce *expressis verbis* his ideal in foreign policy, both pamphlets are dictated by a deep resignation, and actually they plead the abandonment of an active foreign policy of Athens, or at least he remains quite vague as to its aim because in fact he never believed that Athens could have a foreign policy by her own strength. As our business is with A., and with Isokrates only in so far as there can be no doubt of his influence on the ideas of

his contemporaries, we leave undiscussed the question as to how far his influence reached. Personally I think that it was fairly great in the world of ideas and literary discussion, but almost *nil* in practical politics. The political publicist, as Isokrates may best be described, was not a man of action, and he does not seem to have realized the practical effect of the combinations he recommended. I think that the two pamphlets supply the best picture of him and his school: he began to be afraid when action drew near on the political or on the real battlefield. His ideal and that of the circles for whom he wrote was the peacefulness of the bourgeois state, the *ἡσυχία* and *ἀπραγμοσύνη*, which after all is only a caricature of the *ἡσυχία* of the aristocratic state, even if it distinctly shows the ideological connexion with the earlier ideas. It was this ideal which he set forth publicly when he believed to perceive in the breakdown of the recent naval policy a fairly safe possibility of that reactionary reform of the constitution which was enforced upon Athens by the Macedonian arms 35 years later. Like Speusippos and Aristotle he might have felt quite comfortable under the rule of an Antigonos Gonatas, and would have spoken beautifully about Greek culture. It is this which distinguishes him from the true patriots and energetic natures like Demosthenes and A. <sup>54</sup>).

A. remained in political life: in 347/6 B.C. he moved an honorary decree for the sons of Leukon king of Bosphoros <sup>55</sup>). But soon afterwards his fate overtook him, as I believe, on the same Persian question. In 344/3 B.C. there appeared in Athens ambassadors of Artaxerxes, who in preparing the King's great expedition against Egypt sought the help of Thebes, Argos, Sparta, and Athens. While Thebes and Argos made an alliance with the King and Sparta remained neutral, Athens, against the advice of Demosthenes, not only refused help but gave an answer the hostility of which was but slightly veiled <sup>56</sup>). If Diels' supplement of the new T 13 and my conjecture that this testimony comes from Anaximenes' *Περὶ Φιλίππων Ἱστορίαι* are correct (and I have little doubt that they are <sup>57</sup>)) either A. actually spoke against the alliance in the Assembly and was the mover of the obnoxious psephism <sup>58</sup>), or the historian considered A. to be the appropriate person to whom he could attribute a speech against the alliance because of his whole political attitude. In any case we may be certain that A. remained constant to his purpose in foreign policy, *viz.* the national war against Persia, and that even now he favoured a policy fundamentally different from that of Demosthenes. But we cannot decide with certainty by what course

he hoped to attain his purpose. Did he (like Isokrates in the *Panegyrikos* of 380 B.C. and in the *Archidamos* of 366/5 B.C.) believe in the possibility of a Panhellenic union for the national war, *i.e.* a kind of return to the political situation of the Xerxes War under the dyarchy of the two leading states Sparta and Athens? Or was he ready to come to terms with Philip in some way? And did he agree with the latest message of his former teacher to king Philip in 346 B.C.? We may *a priori* be inclined to answer the first question in the affirmative, it is true with the important qualification that A. would probably not (or no longer) have based the Panhellenic combination on a close agreement between Athens and Sparta <sup>59</sup>). The old ideal of the fifth century conservatives, as formulated by Kimon in his exhortation to the people—*παρακαλῶν μήτε τὴν Ἑλλάδα μήτε τὴν πόλιν ἑτερόζυγα περιδεῖν γεγενημένην* <sup>60</sup>)—did reappear in the time of Epameinondas <sup>61</sup>); Isokrates' does not even seem to have abandoned it in the fifties of the fourth century <sup>62</sup>). But a practical politician might consider Sparta, which enjoyed the advantages of the King's Peace, the one great impediment to the union of Greece. Nor had attempts been lacking to unite Hellas against Sparta and against the Persian influence on the Greek cities; but the successes were small and transient. We cannot advance further in this question: it is not easily conceivable that the practical politician A. should have spoken for the principle of the King's Peace even so far as it concerned the autonomy of the Greek cities <sup>62a</sup>), and it is equally hardly possible that as late as 344/3 B.C. he could believe (if he ever did) that the strength of Athens by herself would be sufficient for a war with Persia. Even Demosthenes, late as this was in 341/0 B.C., introduced the idea of a 'Panhellenic' alliance into the sphere of his political considerations, when the decisive combat was threatening; of course he did so with a change of purpose and with the exclusion of Sparta <sup>62b</sup>). The second question may be answered in the negative with some confidence. We may assume that A. approved the conclusion of the peace of Philokrates in 346 B.C. if only because, again, he could hardly believe Athens (or a Panhellenic league) able to fight simultaneously against Persia and Macedonia, and because a peace with Macedonia, which would cover the rear of Athens, was in the view of the practical politician the indispensable preliminary condition for an active policy against Persia <sup>63</sup>). But that A.'s policy was not the same as that of Aischines is shown by the allusion of the latter to A., cautious and malicious at the same time, in his speech against Timarchos <sup>64</sup>); and even more clearly (as it appears

to me) by the course of events. For at this point the well attested fact comes in that when A. wrote his *Atthis* he was in exile at Megara <sup>65</sup>. Regrettably neither the reason for, nor the year of, the exile has come down to us. But I do not find credible the suggestion of Stähelin <sup>66</sup> 5 that as late an event as 'the offensive letter of refusal written by the Persian King in 340 B.C., which the Athenians incurred by the very passing of A.s motion' was the reason for sending A. into exile. The Athenians must have realized the harm they had done by the passing of that motion, when Philip in 344 B.C. made an alliance with Persia 10 on his part, an action which transformed the diplomatic situation to the grave detriment of Athens. But, let us add, the harm was done not by the passing of the motion alone but because the Athenians did not realize what was involved in this policy, thus falling between two stools. We must therefore in my opinion assume an earlier date for the exile 15 of A.: Demosthenes, who found his whole policy endangered by the irresponsible psephism of the Assembly, now took the offensive not only against the pro-Macedonian party, but probably against all opponents of his clear and well-defined (even if disastrous) anti-Macedonian policy. Modern historians speak in this connexion of Philokrates only, who was 20 sentenced to death *in absentia* on a charge of high treason, and Aischines, who had a very narrow escape. With Glotz <sup>67</sup> I should like to add A., not only (if at all) because Demosthenes was a good hater, in whose mind the two defeats of 355/4 and 353/2 B.C. may have rankled, but because the passing of A.s motion in the Assembly was a much more severe 25 blow to his whole policy than the peace of Philokrates, to which he had himself assented, being able to do so without deviating from his consistent policy. A. may have felt the menace of public feeling in Athens, and the old man may have preferred to avoid a trial (as Philokrates did), where he would have had less chance that Aischines, who was unscrupulous 30 and diabolically clever. As he sought refuge in Megara, which at that time was in alliance with Athens <sup>68</sup> and over which a new conflict with Philip had just broken out, we may safely infer that A. was not a friend or partisan of Philip: *he was not pro-Macedonian, he was anti-Persian*; and for him a national war against Persia meant what for Isokrates, 35 and perhaps other conservatives of the pro-Macedonian party, the friendship with Philip meant, *viz.* the way to recover for Athens, as far as possible, her position as the leading power in Hellas. Perhaps he reckoned on public opinion in Athens quickly veering round again. If so he was wrong: the 'reign' of Demosthenes stood firm until he had led his city



into the catastrophe of Chaironeia. It is improbable that A., who was about 65 years old in 344 B.C., saw his native city again.

Before turning to the *Atthis* let us pause for a moment and try to appreciate the man who stands behind the work. As unhappily so little has been preserved of the latter, this seems necessary because the study of the author helps towards understanding the spirit in which the Atthidographers generally wrote the history of their city, beginning just at the time when, with the accession of Philip, fate began to loom, and continuing in the short time between that year and the Chremonidean War when the city was overtaken and swallowed up by that fate, and the late mistress of the Greek Empire became a provincial town whether she was subject to Macedonia or to Rome, or was graciously allowed to play the 'free' city<sup>69</sup>). The task is not easy when we neglect the literary achievement or believe that a hard and fast line can be drawn between the politician A. and the Atthidographer, for the data for the politician in particular are miserably poor. We hear solely the voice of the political opponent, and we do not hear it in a historical work<sup>70</sup>) where we might expect a certain degree, if not of objectivity, at least of regard for facts even in a historian whose bias was toward rhetoric. The picture that has come down to us is painted by that kind of ancient rhetoric which not only does not claim to search for truth, but has the peculiarity—supposed to be justified by the *lex operis*—to depict matters quite unscrupulously according to the demands of the momentary purpose, *viz.* the forensic speech. It is not our business here to pass a judgement on the methods, or on the technique, of Attic law-court speeches. We are simply faced by the fact that Demosthenes, when presenting the political activities of A. to the jurors (βούλομαι δὲ καὶ τὰ πολιτεύματα ἐξετάσαι τοῦ καλοῦ κάγαθοῦ τούτου) formulates his task in the following manner: καὶ γὰρ ἀναιδῆ καὶ θρασὺν καὶ κλέπτῃν καὶ ὑπερήφανον καὶ πάντα μᾶλλον ἢ ἐν δημοκρατίαι πολιτεύεσθαι ἐπιτήδειον ὄντ' ἐπιδείξω<sup>71</sup>). This is the same man whom an Aristotle and a Philochoros closely followed (though, this is important, not without factual criticism) for the account of the historical period proper from Solon to past the middle of the fourth century B.C., and with whose political ideas they evidently sympathized. It seems to be almost superfluous to open a discussion on the merits of the case, or refer to the fact that the man whom the orator primarily tries to make suspect before a democratic jury because he was an aristocrat, was acquitted not by one but by two democratic juries. Demosthenes was master of the method of using personal slander against an opponent, without even

a trace of the good humour and wit of Comedy, and it is almost universally agreed to-day that these two speeches are perhaps the most unpleasant specimens of an altogether unpleasant custom <sup>72</sup>). We need not analyze in detail the contents and the ideas developed in them in order to recognize that for a just appreciation of A. we have to shut our ears resolutely against the vociferations of Demosthenes' clients, hearing not what the speakers tell us but what they do not. It is rather obvious that the statements which the orator gives to Diodoros consist almost exclusively in lies, and poor lies at that. As it is, the first speech is almost a title of honour for A. The points Demosthenes makes, or tries to make, are amazingly weak. There are the usual insinuations about the sexual life of the defendant, but they are remarkably tame, being confined to the reproach *ἐταιρήσεως*, which is a *cliché* in a case against a *καλὸς κάγαθός*; and though the speaker enlarges on this point in twelve sections <sup>73</sup>) it is apparently much ado about nothing. There follows quite a short assertion (short because it seems to be without foundation) that A. is *ἄτιμος* because his father died without having paid his debts to the State <sup>74</sup>). That is all the orator is able to say about the personal antecedents of the defendant, before he turns to his political activities <sup>75</sup>) and covers with a tetracolon of invective terms the entirely futile description of his conduct in the execution of the financial decrees; for it is the conduct only, as not even Demosthenes dares to attack the decrees themselves. It is rather comical to see in § 51 what this accusation amounts to <sup>76</sup>). Desperately anxious to show him up as a bad citizen he reproaches him finally with not having accused any of the generals or politicians in a political career of more than thirty years <sup>77</sup>). In our eyes this abstention from the detestable practice of the Athenian orators and the Assembly who liked to find scapegoats for their own mistaken policies, does as much credit to A. as the fact (carefully omitted by the speaker) that evidently he was not once accused himself, quite unlike his temporary ally Aristophon who in his long life *γραφὰς παρανόμων πέφευγεν ἑβδομήκοντα πάντα* <sup>78</sup>). If we consider at the same time that the 'oligarch' as they term him (the *καλὸς κάγαθός* says Demosthenes) when accused for once was acquitted by democratic juries we may be sure that A. was fairly blameless. I should have dismissed the speech of Demosthenes with an even shorter mention, were it not for the remarkable use that some modern writers have made of it, even when they were not swayed *a priori* by a prejudice for Demosthenes in spite of all. To me at least it seems a curious method when *e.g.* Blass <sup>79</sup>) balances the invectives

of the speech against the praise in the inscription of Arkesine <sup>80</sup>), and compromises by making the two witnesses neutralize each other. In fact, the inscription is a very positive testimony in favour of A. Even if in the ordinary course of things one does not attach great value to an honorary decree passed by the corporation of a small town, this decree, carried after the end of A.'s commandership of the Athenian garrison, is somewhat out of the common: it does not speak in the ready-made phrases of municipal eulogy but describes quite definitely the conduct and certain actions of A. performed when he was in a position which seems to have been usually regarded as a source of profit for the holder. Again the behaviour of Aristophon in Keos in 363/2 B.C. seems by contrast to help appreciate the conduct of A. <sup>81</sup>). His conduct shows that he knew what was at stake for Athens in this war, and that in his intercourse with the allies he acted accordingly: on his part he avoided, or tried to minimize, the consequences of the worst mistake the Athenian democracy had made in the treatment of its subjects and allies, a mistake unavoidable perhaps so long as the idea of a constitution on the representative principle was repugnant to the Greek spirit, but which yielded a harvest of hate, no matter whether the leadership in the dominant state was in the hands of a Perikles or of the politicians of the second Naval League <sup>82</sup>).

I am far from trying to make an ideal figure of A. Schwartz may be right in his opinion that 'as a politician A. was neither better nor worse than any Athenian statesman of the time', but personally I do not believe that this opinion, derived from the judgement of Blass on the speeches of Demosthenes <sup>83</sup>), does justice to the special case. A. was not only a politician, he was a writer of distinction as well, and I for one should be glad to exchange some of Demosthenes' speeches for one of the later books of the *Atthis*. Even leaving out of consideration the truly astonishing ignorance of most of the Attic orators and the little use they made of the history of their city <sup>84</sup>), these literary activities surely create a difference between A. and the common brand of Athenian politicians, and I maintain that they throw a light also on his political career such as it was. What we know about A. (partly from speeches which try to distort his character) does seem to justify the assertion that morally he was well above the average party politician. He did not practise politics as a business; he had moral principles, and he seems to have been a patriot and an idealist <sup>85</sup>). Though he was, to say the least, well to do, and belonged to the upper classes by birth and by family tradition,

he did not simply fall in with what is sometimes called 'the party of the rich men'. I should rather say that he belonged to the 'party' of decent and honorable men who were not lacking at any time even in a 'degenerate' democracy, apt though we are to forget this element (not in Athens alone) which is the real backbone of every state. The influence of this element seldom is as great as it ought to be because too few persons belong to it, and by their very nature they too often hold aloof from the 'dirty' game of politics. A. tried to effect something in politics. He tried to steer a middle course between the parties which at this time,

10 difficult economically and otherwise, practised a policy of self-interest, perhaps the conservatives even more than the radical democrats. There can be no doubt as to his fundamentally conservative attitude: in this respect the *Atthis* speaks a clear language<sup>86</sup>). He tried to show by the history of Athens that the conservative party was justified in urging

15 on every possible occasion (Isokrates in the *Areopagitikos* was the last) a revision of the constitution impressively described by Aristotle<sup>87</sup>):

ἐνδεκάτη δ' ἡ μετὰ τὴν ἀπὸ Φυλῆς καὶ ἐκ Πειραιέως κάθοδον, ἀφ' ἧς διαγεγνηται μέχρι τῆς νῦν, αἰεὶ προσεπιλαμβάνουσα τῶι πλήθει τὴν ἐξουσίαν· ἀπάντων γὰρ αὐτὸς αὐτὸν πεποίηκεν ὁ δῆμος κύριον, καὶ πάντα διοικεῖται ψηφισμασιν καὶ δικαστηρίοις, ἐν οἷς ὁ δῆμός ἐστιν ὁ κρατῶν· καὶ γὰρ αἱ τῆς βουλῆς κλίσεις εἰς τὸν δῆμον ἐληλύθασιν. A. did not recommend as against this constitution an equally radical reaction which would have enslaved the demos in favour of the vested rights and the money bags of the upper classes, a return, as it were, to the conditions of the aristocratic state,

25 which again has been best described by Aristotle, and which *mutatis mutandis* may have been dimly conceived in the minds of the genuine fourth century reactionaries<sup>88</sup>). Nor did A. want the oligarchy which in 404/3 B.C. had lasted for a short time under the Thirty and had been ready to give up not only the Empire but the autonomy of Athens as

30 well because it could hold its own against the Demos only with the help of the Spartan army. The ideal of A. was the *πολιτεία* as it had been created by Solon and Kleisthenes, at least according to the conservative conception of the development of the Athenian constitution<sup>89</sup>). According to the same conception this constitution had lasted until the dethronement

35 of the Areopagos by the now truly revolutionary legislation of Ephialtes in 462/1 B.C., i.e. between the Persian War and the rupture with Sparta. The moderate conservative seems to have regarded this period as the golden time of Athens. It had a very short revival when the constitution of Theramenes in 412/0 B.C. placed the power in the hands of the Five

Thousand, the *δπλα παρεχόμενοι*. This attitude exactly agrees with the views of Isokrates, but there is this difference that the latter cautiously names the *ἀρχαῖοι* only, Solon and Kleisthenes, thus actually falsifying the historical picture, whereas A. had the courage of his conviction and evidently not only described at length the reform of 411/0 B.C., but also defended Theramenes as the true successor of the *ἀρχαῖοι* against all attacks of public opinion and political writings, perhaps in particular against the first Athenian *Atthis*, that of Kleidemos <sup>90</sup>). The reform which A. advocated did not necessarily signify the abandonment by Athens of her claim to a leading position in Greek affairs, though this position could certainly not be the same as that which she had held as mistress of her empire (*ἀρχή*) in the times of Perikles. The ideas which politicians formed about that position may have been vague (those of Isokrates certainly were <sup>91</sup>), for the forms both for the details of the new constitution and for the union of the Greeks had still to be found. Matters were no longer so simple for the opposition as they had been a century earlier. Then there existed the alliance with Ionia, with Athens as the leader, an alliance which even the party of Thukydides was not prepared to liquidate, and the aims of foreign policy were given: friendly terms with Sparta and the continuing of the war with Persia. We need not regard as a mere rhetorical flourish the words with which Isokrates vaguely concludes his reform-speech: *ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν ἡγούμενος, ἦν μιμησώμεθα τοὺς προγόνους καὶ τῶν κακῶν ἡμᾶς τούτων ἀπαλλαγῆσεσθαι καὶ σωτηρίας οὐ μόνον τῆς πόλεως ἀλλὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀπάντων γενήσεσθαι, . . . . τοὺς λόγους εἰρηκα τούτους* <sup>92</sup>). But what is positive here is mainly the (certainly honest) conviction that a steady and successful foreign policy must have as its foundation a stable constitution. We may ask whether the party for which Isokrates now spoke desired any active foreign policy at all; and if they did what was its aim. So far as we can see the bulk of the conservative party was altogether opposed to any policy of war, and in the existing circumstances this meant renunciation of any active foreign policy. Isokrates shared this resigned attitude at least during and after the Social War, or, we might say, after the final overthrow of Timotheos <sup>94</sup>). It is on this point that opinions became divided. The few data which we have for A.s views on foreign policy begin with the Social War and show clearly that he did not share the defeatism: he evidently had the wrong, but patriotic, conviction that Athens was powerful enough for practising a foreign policy independently and in agreement with her honourable past. This means independence from

Macedonia or any other power, and in this connexion it only remains uncertain whether A. considered as desirable, perhaps even necessary, friendly, or at least peaceful, relations with Philip <sup>96</sup>). If he did his policy was diametrically opposed to that of Demosthenes who among the possible combinations pronounced in favour of friendly relations with Persia and a decided policy against Macedonia. But we must not forget that there were more than two combinations for an active policy, and that among these combinations the Panhellenic solution, which could either include or exclude Philip, was obvious and important. Isokrates turned to it when this possibility was opened for him by the peace of Philokrates. We do not know the attitude of A. in this situation <sup>96</sup>). The only certain fact is that he pursued a clear and consistent line in the last ten or fifteen years of his life of which alone we have some knowledge. The waging of a national war against Persia may have seemed to him to make possible a renaissance of the conservative party. This wish to see Athens win back her former title to glory as the defender of Greek life and culture (for culture now was brought into the ideal <sup>97</sup>) against the barbarian, revived in the changed conditions of the fourth century, and A. may have qualified accordingly the early ideas of Kimon and the conservatives as opposed to the political aim of Themistokles which Perikles adopted after the death of Kimon. This wish overrode (perhaps only in the course of time) the selfish class interests. It did not make A. a democrat. He surely knew from history and from Thukydides that radical democracy had failed to uphold the leading position of Athens, and he was well aware of the obvious defects in her fourth century constitution; but it made him willing to cooperate with the democrats, as soon and as long as they were prepared to work in the direction in which he believed the historical and the Panhellenic task of Athens to lie <sup>98</sup>). Ideas like these are by no means frequent in fourth century Athenian politics. They are entirely remote from the sphere of thought of Isokrates, who after all merely presents the conservative programme wrapped up in fine 'facts' historically wrong, and who does so in a moment similar to that after the expedition to Sicily, in which in view of the spiritual attitude of a people sobered by defeats he can hope for success. A. may also have had in mind 'historical events' and the attitude of the best elements of the old aristocracy at the time of the empire <sup>99</sup>). But from his practical conduct in widely different circumstances we must infer that, in contrast to many conservatives, he had a foreign policy which was not merely a by-product of his convictions in regard to home policy, and we must

assume that his alliance with the democrats in regard to foreign policy influenced his standpoint in home policy. This cannot be strictly proved by the fragments of the *Atthis*, but I think we may use A.s treatment of the Solonian *σεισάχθεια*<sup>100</sup>) for this purpose: in agreement with his 5 fundamentally conservative attitude and in the face of social demands which had recently been heard again under the economic pressure of the time<sup>101</sup>), A. denied the character of the *σεισάχθεια* as a revolutionary confiscation of property, explaining it simply as a considerable relief for debtors and for the poor generally. He described Solon as a reformer 10 not in politics only but also in the sphere of social conditions, believing that he tried to put an end to class conflicts because they endangered the very existence of the State. Aristotle followed him in these points although he did not accept A.s re-interpretation of Solon's revolutionary measure<sup>102</sup>). Probably A. appreciated the economic activities of Peisi- 15 stratos in his tyranny: the solicitude of the tyrant for the peasant class may have been sympathetic to the author of the *Georgikon*<sup>103</sup>). I think we may with a fair degree of certainty consider A. the source of 'Ath. ch. 24, which claims as a merit of Aristides not only the imperial policy (*ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι τῆς ἡγεμονίας*) but particularly the maintenance of the 20 poor population from the receipts of the empire, dating back the principle at least to the period of the 'rule of the Areopagos', 480-463 B.C.<sup>104</sup>). If I am right, A. showed for the situation of the poor and for economic questions generally a degree of understanding which cannot be expected in the majority of the 'bourgeoisie' or the conservative party: the 'rich' 25 at that time refused to pay their taxes, and when the issue of the Lamian War led to the pressing on them of an 'oligarchic' constitution (which, incidentally, showed considerable resemblance to that of Theramenes) they tried to take the opportunity of removing the poor altogether, so far as this was possible, in a manner (it may be remarked) which was 30 discussed even in A.s time when cleruchies were possible in exceptional cases only<sup>105</sup>).

We are moving here on uncertain ground, and in any case I should like to give a warning against overrating A.s importance as a politician, or even as a historical thinker<sup>106</sup>). His influence could not be considerable 35 if only because of his lack of position: he was not a *δημαγωγός*, if one means by that term that he ever guided the policy of Athens like Kallistratos, Aristophon, Eubulos, or Demosthenes. He was not the leader of the conservative party, perhaps not even of a group, and the few motions from the 'seventies, which may be part of a policy of restoration,

do not stand a comparison with the purposeful and effective reforms of Lykurgos, which the Atthidographer Phanodemos supported in literature. If we wish to give an opinion of A. at all (and I think we must because of the *Atthis*) we must take into account the conditions of his time.

5 This lies between the King's Peace in 387/6 B.C. and the definite breach with Macedonia in 341/0 B.C., a period of almost continuous conflicts, great decisions, and momentous events inside and outside Greece proper: the founding of a new naval league and the collapse of it in the Social War, the rise of Thebes and the downfall of Sparta, the intervention in

10 Greek affairs by the new great power of Sicily, the phenomena of dissolution in the Persian realm, and the rapid rise of Macedonia under the purposeful guidance of Philip. The result of all these combats and combinations is from the point of view of Greece that none of her cities could attain, or at any rate keep for any considerable time, a position of hege-

15 mony; from the point of view of Athens, that all sacrifices, made for the recovery of her former position as a great power, were in vain. The whole period, from the end of the Great War to the foundation of the Macedonian hegemony, is dominated by conditions which Xenophon summarized at the end of his Greek History after the battle of Mantinea in 362 B.C.:

20 ἀριστία δὲ καὶ ταραχὴ ἔτι πλείων μετὰ τὴν μάχην ἐγένετο ἢ πρόσθεν ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι 107). For the historian looking back at this period there can be no doubt that the end of the Great War is the end of ancient Hellas; the time of the classic form of her political life, the city-state, is irretrievably gone, and a new period is coming to birth with painful labour 108).

25 It would be foolish to expect that the contemporaries, or even the spiritual leaders, should have realized this turn of the time, that they should have been able to show a new aim to the old powers, thus preventing useless opposition. Thukydidēs did not live to draw the conclusion from his description of the decisive combat for hegemony between the great-

30 est land power and the greatest sea power, and incidentally for the unity of Greece. Half a century later his most ingenious, and politically most interested, successors Kallisthenes and Theopompos wrote Greek history according to the ideas of Philip, but with a different attitude towards Athens: the latter giving up the type of *Hellenika* in favour of

35 the actions (πράξεις) of a man the like of whom 'Europe had not hitherto produced' 109), the former stating the bankruptcy of the Greek states by comparing the peace-treaties of Kallias and Antialkidas 110). Nevertheless it remains uncertain for us how far they were able to bring out in the events the illuminating historical idea, as Herodotos, Thukydidēs, and



Polybios (whom we may in this respect group with the former two) were able to do. Plato and Aristotle, the greatest minds of the fourth century, whom we cannot easily suppose free from a sense of the impending doom, the *urguentia imperii jata*, did not find a new solution for the problem of the political form of the Greek people; they continued to construct the best state in the form of the city-state, even at a time when Alexander was standing in Asia and beginning to organize the empire of the world. Others went too far, abandoning altogether the idea of the state in favour of humanity as a whole. An appreciation of the new conditions can be seen only in the attempts at educating a sovereign instead of a population, but the success attained in this domain is not encouraging, nor do the attempts show a great amount of insight. Can we be surprised when practical politicians took no notice of these theoretical discussions, and when they tried instead to remedy the ills of their days by following former methods, leading their cities on the old roads?

A. was a practical politician. He certainly was on a level with the general education of his time <sup>110</sup>, he had historical interests, he had thought about the history of his native city and, in the manner of Thukydidides, he had tried to learn from it <sup>110</sup>). Still, so far as we can judge, he was lacking in theoretical interests proper, nor had he any relations with philosophy, not even, like Theopompos, hostile relations <sup>111</sup>). We saw the course by which he considered possible the restoration of former conditions not for Athens alone but most probably for all Hellas; we saw too that in the last critical time he took this course as unswervingly as Demosthenes took his, more consistently than Isokrates from whom he separated perhaps when the old man sounded the retreat in the Social War, and certainly when, despairing of Athens' power to help herself, he expected the salvation of Greece from Philip. It would, of course, be to no purpose to compare A. and Demosthenes, if only because the former, though able on some occasions to influence the decisions of the people in important questions of foreign policy, had not the opportunity open to a leader of the people for testing the practicability of his course. It would be to even less purpose to judge on the 'correctness' of the different policies by the wisdom (or the conflicting wisdoms) of the different historians, to praise Demosthenes and to brand Isokrates and A. (so far as notice is taken of the latter in this connexion, which is not often) as political ignoramuses, or *vice versa*. We might stop for a moment to consider how Plato would fare, or even Aristotle, if we applied the same standard to their political activities, judging them by their opinions

about Athenian history, the empire, and its leaders. It is of no consequence at all in this connexion that Plato is the greatest philosopher and Demosthenes the greatest orator, and that the name of Isokrates (for all his 'humanistic' influence) cannot be uttered in the same breath.

5 Both Plato and Demosthenes failed dismally in the domain of practical politics, in Athens and outside. There is no doubt that Isokrates, if ever he had tried politics, would also have failed, and I am by no means prepared to maintain that the essence of his policy would have yielded better results, or proved feasible at all, in the hands of a practical man

10 like A. It is easy to state (and to see) now that the idea of uniting Greece for a national war against Persia, or the idea of attempting this war with the power of Athens and her allies alone, was impracticable and an anachronism, even though signs of the internal weakness of the unwieldy Persian empire were not absent: never since the days of Agamemnon's

15 Trojan War (as Thukydides saw it <sup>112</sup>) had Greece been united for an offensive war, and in the fourth century there was no man and no city equal to a task which even Philip and Alexander only performed by brutal force. Here is the true difference between the statement of a historical fact by Herodotos (νῦν δὲ Ἀθηναίους ἂν τις λέγων σωτῆρας γενέσθαι τῆς

20 Ἑλλάδος οὐκ ἂν ἁμαρτάνοι τὰ ληθέος <sup>113</sup>) and the belief of Isokrates, evidently referring to these words, that, thanks to a reform of their constitution, the Athenians again σωτῆρας οὐ μόνον τῆς πόλεως ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἑλλήνων ἀπάντων γενήσεσθαι <sup>114</sup>). If anybody regards this ideal as a proof of A.'s want of historical insight and as showing the politician's failure

25 to appreciate the situation of Greece after the Twenty Seven Years' War, he cannot and shall not be refuted. But if we judge him 'lässlich in den grenzen seines wesens und seiner zeit', we had better say positively that A. had a not contemptible ideal and that, in the transitional period which Athens and Greece had to go through, he served this ideal, so far

30 as we can see, unhesitatingly, honestly, and unselfishly.

This long digression may not have been superfluous if it has enabled us to appraise the person who stands behind the work. Let us now return to the *Atthis*. The peculiar feature of it is that to our knowledge it is the only history of Athens written by an active politician. This combination is quite a common phenomenon in Rome, where we find it in various

35 forms, whereas it is rare in Athens (perhaps in Greece generally). The *Atthidographers* whom we know were men interested in politics, but not active in political life <sup>115</sup>). This fact causes us to ask whether A. simply wrote to occupy his enforced leisure, or whether he felt the need

to justify his political activities <sup>116</sup>), or, finally, whether he used writing as the only means left to him for influencing public opinion in Athens against the man who again was driving the State to a suicidal combat with Macedonia and was so unscrupulous as to look for help to the hereditary enemy of Greece. Of course, we cannot answer this question with certainty; after all the various motives may have worked in combination. But the form of his book as an *Atthis*, a form which Kleidemos not long before had made a weapon in political contests <sup>117</sup>), and the contents of his particular *Atthis*, which more than any other laid the emphasis on the history of Athens as distinguished from antiquities <sup>118</sup>), favour the idea that the last of the three motives furnished the decisive impetus. In any case, we may regard as a fact what Plutarch tells us that A. wrote in exile, for I think it has been inferred from the most reliable source, *viz.* A.'s own preface <sup>119</sup>). Thukydides had opened the second part of his work with personal statements <sup>120</sup>), and subsequently in the fourth century, with the introduction of division into books, the preface became the place where authors talked about themselves and made statements not only about the contents and the purpose of their works (this was formerly done in the sentence taking the place of a heading) but also about their lives (strictly speaking so far as the life explained the work), their style, and their manner of treating the subject-matter. Thus the assumption drops out that A. began his work 'a considerable time before his exile' <sup>121</sup>), an assumption not supported by facts and one which should not be made unnecessarily in view of the lively political activity of A. after the Social War. I think we may assume that he began to write at once: he was an old man when he was exiled and had no time to lose; if my date of the exile in autumn 343/2 B.C. <sup>122</sup>) is correct he began in that year. How long the work took cannot be said. But in view of A.'s descent, education, and his whole nature we may assume an interest in, and correspondingly some knowledge of, the history of his city. He did not waste his time with stylistic elaboration <sup>123</sup>), so that there is no reason for going far into the 'thirties for the conclusion of his work <sup>124</sup>). The books were probably sent to Athens for publication individually, and as a rough date *c.* 340 B.C. may serve <sup>125</sup>).

35 The *Ἀρχαί*, as the work is almost generally cited although we do not know whether A. himself gave that title to it <sup>126</sup>), was used soon after its publication by Aristotle, who sympathized with the author, as his chief source in the survey of the history, or rather the constitution, of Athens: he probably took from A. all his dates and most of the historical

facts<sup>127</sup>). Later Philochoros used it, especially for the historical time, to such a degree that we can almost call that part of his *Atthis* a revision of the corresponding books of A.<sup>128</sup>), though he modified the restriction to, or the particular stress laid on, political history<sup>129</sup>). The book remained one of the principal works on Attic history, although in general use it naturally receded behind the *Atthis* of Philochoros<sup>130</sup>) which, extending down to the loss of Athenian independence, altogether concluded this species of Athenian literature. Nevertheless we have almost 70 fragments<sup>131</sup>), twice as many as we have of Kleidemos or Phanodemos<sup>132</sup>), and almost half of them carry the number of a book. The work began, like all *Atthides*, with the primeval time and the early kings<sup>133</sup>), and it reached down to at least 344/3 B.C.<sup>134</sup>), but hardly much further<sup>135</sup>). For this space of time A. took eight books<sup>136</sup>), twice as many as Kleidemos who wrote only a few years earlier, so that the greater length can certainly not be due solely to the number of years with which the two works dealt. But when we compare the earlier *Atthides* as far as we can establish the contents of each single book, we see at once that A. treated in far greater detail the history of the fourth century and his own time, particularly the 'fifties and 'forties, in which alone his activities are actually known to us. The most regrettable fact is that we cannot determine exactly for any two books the point at which one ended and the other began. Of course, the knowledge of the contents of each book would make possible, or facilitate, the reference of certain fragments to certain events; but apart from that, the uncertainty is regrettable even in a chronicle because in an author with a clear-cut political creed it would be enlightening to be able to discern accurately the periods into which he divided the history of Athens. As matters are, we can only state with a certain probability that the end of the Peloponnesian War, *i.e.* for an Athenian the restoration of democracy in 403/2 B.C., was the point of division between the two main parts of the work, *viz.* the pre-history and the contemporary history (the latter term taken in a wider sense). But I should not contradict anyone who would prefer to put this boundary between the fifth and the sixth book, starting from which the narrative became considerably more detailed. However this may be, it is fairly certain that the first book included the history of the kings and probably no more than that, *i.e.* it ended with the abolition of royalty<sup>137</sup>). The second book described the 'aristocratic' state<sup>138</sup>) and the constitution of Kleisthenes<sup>139</sup>); it therefore included the legislation of Solon. This shows that A. dispatched at least the 'Archaeology' more briefly

than Kleidemos did, who dealt with Kleisthenes in the third book <sup>140</sup>). The latest date attested for book II is the first ostracism in 488/7 B.C. <sup>141</sup>). Seeing that this date does not mark the end of any historical period, and taking into account A.s attitude in home policy, we may venture to suppose that the second book reached down to the year of the decisive changes in the constitution effected by Ephialtes in 463/2 B.C. <sup>142</sup>). For the third book the Peloponnesian War is certain <sup>143</sup>); it extended at least to 405/4 B.C., but surely it also included the after-effects, *i.e.* the rule of the Thirty καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς <sup>144</sup>). Possibly the year of the reform 403/2 B.C. opened the fourth book. Otherwise books IV and V present the greatest difficulties. We have only one historical fragment from the former <sup>145</sup>), and if the number of the book has come down correctly (the alteration of Δ̄ to Γ̄ would be easy) we cannot date it. The dateable citations from the fifth book refer to 397/6 and 360/59 (359/8) B.C., <sup>15</sup> and possibly to 375 or 371 B.C. <sup>146</sup>). There must be some error in F 18 from 397/6 B.C., for even if the legislation of the year of Eukleides occurred in book IV and not in book III, it seems almost impossible that the fourth book should have included no more than the five years from 402/1 (403/2) to 398/7 B.C., while the fifth book dealt with the <sup>20</sup> thirty-five years 396/5-361/0 (360/59) B.C., a period of great importance and full of historical events. But as it is not easy to change Ε̄ into Δ̄, we cannot guess where IV ended and V began, though the foundation of the second Athenian Naval League in 378/7 B.C. (which is an important year in the internal life of the State as well) seems to be more likely <sup>25</sup> than the peace of Antialkidas in 387/6 B.C. The former event as the end of book IV would give us 25 years for the fourth, and 18 for the fifth book, a solution which would be at least credible. As to the end of the fifth book, we should like to know whether 359/8 B.C. was an epochal year for A. in the same sense as it was for Isokrates, who in the *Antidosis* <sup>147</sup>) praised the στρατηγία of Timotheos as a most happy time for Athens, and who in the *Areopagitikos* <sup>148</sup>) dates the decline of the Naval League μετὰ τὴν Τιμοθέου στρατηγίαν. In any case, the dateable citations from the sixth book refer to the Social War, the Sacred War, the activities of Philip, and to the years 357/6-354 /3 B.C. <sup>149</sup>). As 353/2 B.C. is treated <sup>30</sup> in the seventh book, another citation of which refers to 350/49 B.C. <sup>150</sup>), the sixth book included six and the seventh at least four years. It is most regrettable that we cannot date the one fragment from the eighth book <sup>151</sup>) and that we are not certain about the final year of the whole work <sup>152</sup>). But it is quite clear that the narrative in the last three books,

which included less than twenty years, was very detailed, and that A. himself regarded the period from 359 to 344 (?) B.C. as critical for Athens and at the same time as the peak of his own political activities<sup>183</sup>). The proportion of space allotted to the more than three centuries from approximately 683/2 to 360/59 B.C., or to the last 43 years of that period, and to the last twenty years of himself and Athens shows very clearly that A. was much more interested in the future of Athens (or, if one prefers to put it so, in the history of his own time) than in the past, so far as he could not use the latter for explaining his political views on the best form of government for his native city.

### T(ESTIMONIES)

- (1) On the source see p. 86, 1 ff.; on the father and the teachers of A. see p. 87, 12 ff.
- (2-3) About the orator and the stylist A. see p. 86, 20 ff.; about the value of the charges of Demosthenes p. 93, 3 ff.
- (4-13) About the individual pieces of information, in which there is a gap of about twenty years between the first half of the 'seventies and the Social War, see p. 87, 35 ff.
- (6) Demosth. 22, 42-68; 24, 160-171. This measure is usually dated in the Social War. 'Money had to be procured by every possible means: the law of Leptines, the psephisms of Aristophon (Demosth. 14, 11) belong to this time. A. was appointed member of a Board of Ten for collecting outstanding *war-taxes* (my italics)'<sup>1</sup>). Kahrstedt contradicted<sup>2</sup>) because the measure seems to imply that the προεισφορά, attested by Demosth. 50, 42 for shortly after 360 B.C., did not yet exist, and suggested 374 B.C. The attack of Demosthenes, who scrutinized the entire previous political career of A.<sup>3</sup>), does not enable us to decide in favour of the earlier date, but the Scholia state expressly παρέχβασις ἐντεῦθεν· παρεχβαίνειν γὰρ δοκεῖ τῆς ὑποθέσεως, λέγων ἄπερ πρώτων ἐπραξε ὁ Ἄνδρῳτιων; they probably knew the date of the ψηφίσματα δεινὰ καὶ παράνομα. In favour of the dating in the Social War we might at the utmost adduce that A. was a member of the Council in 356/5 B.C.<sup>4</sup>); but as early a writer as Schaefer<sup>5</sup>) perceived that this was not necessarily a preliminary condition for the membership of a commission like that mentioned above. In my opinion the words of Demosthenes 24, 48 at the opening of the section about the εἰσπραξίς decidedly recommend the earlier date—δημηγορίαν δ' ἐπὶ τούτοις ποιούμενος, ὡς ἔστι τριῶν αἰρεσις, ἢ τὰ πομπεία

κατακόπτει ἢ πάλιν εἰσφέρειν ἢ τοὺς ὀφείλοντας εἰσπράττειν. The proposal deliberately put in the first place, which obviously was not meant seriously, is more impressive if the new πομπεία had been made only a few years before <sup>6</sup>). In 374/3 B.C. also the financial need made itself acutely felt: the war with Sparta again broke out about Zakynthos and Korkyra <sup>7</sup>) when the peace of 375/4 B.C. had just been welcomed with joy and relief <sup>8</sup>). The bad progress, caused chiefly by want of money, led to the removal of Timotheos and to his being accused by Kallistratos and Iphikrates in autumn 373 B.C., and the former took over the government. It is most comprehensible that a man from the circle of Isokrates, to which A. belonged at that time, endeavoured to procure the money for the equipment of the fleet.

(7) See p. 95, 2 ff.: The inscription is usually dated in the Social War and in 357/6 B.C., as A. was a member of the Council in 356/5 B.C.

<sup>15</sup> (8) The date of 355/4 B.C., established by Boenicke *Studien* I, 1843, p. 729, has rightly been universally accepted. In favour of Schwartz' date 'probably shortly before the Social War' <sup>9</sup>) we can only state that Demosthenes 24, 11 speaks of 'the τριηραρχήσαντες', and that this term seems to indicate the time before the law of Periander, although this <sup>20</sup> kind of trierarchy did not stop all at once. An embassy to Maussolos, who in 359/8 had made his peace with Artaxerxes Ochos <sup>10</sup>), would, of course, fit well into that time, not however the 'lame protest' which was to call to the memory of the dynast the enactments of the King's Peace about the autonomy of the Greek cities. Evidently the situation <sup>25</sup> is that at the end of the Social War, when Maussolos (with the help of the propertied classes) had posted garrisons in Kos, Rhodes, and probably Chios. It would agree with this that the privateering affair does not emerge until the *Timocratea*, and the hypothesis of this speech in the Scholia (which, again, probably had the documentary date of the em- <sup>30</sup> bassy) furnishes the corroboration: Μαύσωλος . . . ὑπήκοος ὦν τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν Περσῶν, βουλόμενος αὐτὸν πρὸς πλείονα εὐνοϊαν ἐλκύσαι, ἐπεχείρησε καταδουλώσασθαι αὐτῷ τὰς γ' ταύτας νήσους, Χίον καὶ Ῥόδον καὶ Κῶν. εἶτα μαθόντες οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐπεμψαν πρέσβεις ἐγκαλοῦντες αὐτῷ <sup>11</sup>).

(12) See p. 90, 21 ff. By the help of this inscription A. Schaefer <sup>35</sup> (*Rh. Mus.* 33, 1878, p. 418) rearranged the chronology, confused by Diodoros, of the dynasts of Bosphorus. Cf. Kirchner *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 206; Beloch *Gr. G.*<sup>2</sup> III 1 p. 133 ff.; 2 p. 91 f.

(13) See p. 90, 22 ff. and on F 53.

(14) See p. 103, 12 ff.

(15) Cf. *Introd.* n. 86.

(16) It is somewhat surprising to find the name of A. in the catalogue (cf. *Introd.* n. 118); but after all he narrated the history of the kings, if more succinctly than even Philochoros. The learned authors of the 5 books *Περὶ κλοπῆς* probably had this first book in view. If so, T 16 is the best proof that as early as the last quarter of the third century these two authors had eclipsed all other Attidographers with the general public (cf. p. 103, 35 ff.); the other *Attides*, which probably yielded much more for the myths and the cult, were chiefly used by those who 10 wrote antiquarian books about Athens.

(17) Judging by the contents (see in particular F 81-82) and by the title *Γεωργικόν* (F 75-80) there can be no doubt that the book belonged to the sphere of technical writings. F 78 proves that it was one book only; this favours the idea of an early date and a practical purpose<sup>12)</sup>. The 15 story in F 76, which does not give the impression of an Athenian author<sup>13)</sup> and which is not really a metamorphosis, may have been added by one of the Hellenistic revisers. Considering the character of A. I see no actual reason for doubting the authenticity<sup>14)</sup>, even less because a book with the same title (but apparently more theoretical) was assigned to his predecessor Kleidemos. The fact that the work is not mentioned in Aristotle 20 *Pol.* I, 4, 4 (where examples of this species of writing are given) does not definitely tell against the authenticity, nor does the fact that Varro (who is copying the catalogue of a library) does not give the native place of the author. But of course we cannot prove the book to be authentic, we can 25 only make this appear probable by general considerations about the economic (and political) situation in Athens in the middle of the fourth century. In no case must we assume a forgery as Susemihl *Gr. Lit.* I p. 833 and Wellmann *R E Suppl.* I col. 82 did: forgeries are exceptions, and A. was not sufficiently famous for his name to be thus used.

30

## F(RAGMENTS)

(1-3) About the contents of the first book see p. 104, 34 ff. Few though the fragments are, they are sufficient for proving that A. treated the kings in the sequence established by Hellanikos, and probably simply accepted by Kleidemos, as we expect in a chronicle. It is improbable 35 that he began with a king earlier than Kekrops; see on Philochoros 328 F 92.

(1) The Kerykes were probably treated by Kleidemos too in his first



book (323 F 5); he seems to have been interested in their cultic functions. The organization of the priests' aristocracy in Eleusis did not occur in Hellanikos (323a F 8) till the second book. A. probably merely gave in passing the ancestry of the famous *genos*. This supposition is favoured by the form, frequent in pedigrees, of mentioning in the last place that person of whom something special can be told. But the sequence may equally well be due to the excerptor, and A. may have added similar brief remarks concerning the other daughters <sup>1</sup>). The ancestor of the family is transparently fictitious, and was certainly firmly established at least in the tradition of the *genos* <sup>2</sup>). As to the ancestress the tradition fluctuates remarkably. The Kerykes themselves seem to have named different daughters of Kekrops (at different times?), for we have sound attestations for all three <sup>3</sup>). There can be no serious doubt that in naming Pandrosos A. gives the official tradition of the clan in the fourth century <sup>4</sup>); but according to Pausan. I, 38, 3 αὐτοὶ Κήρυκες give Aglauros, who in Hellanikos' *Atthis* (323a F 1) becomes the mother of Alkippe by Ares, and who according to others (among them perhaps Philochoros 328 F 105) sacrifices herself as a virgin for her native country. Finally the poem of Marcellus for Herodes Atticus <sup>5</sup>), who himself claimed to be a Keryx, mentioned Herse, who according to *Bibl.* 3, 181 became the mother of Kephalos by Ares. Attention should be paid to the fluctuations in the story of the bringing up of Erichthonios, in which it is sometimes Pandrosos, sometimes Herse who is free from blame <sup>6</sup>).

(2) It is remarkable that A. is cited here not as usual alongside of Philochoros, but alongside of Hellanikos. About the tradition of the institution of the Panathenaia see on Istros 334 F 4.

(3-4) (1a) Isokr. *Areop.* 37 οὕτω γὰρ ἡμῶν οἱ πρόγονοι σφόδρα περὶ τὴν σωφροσύνην ἐσπούδασαν, ὥστε τὴν ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλὴν ἐπέστησαν ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τῆς εὐκοσμίας, ἧς οὐχ οἶόν τ' ἦν μετασχεῖν πλὴν τοῖς καλῶς γεγονόσι καὶ πολλὴν ἀρετὴν καὶ σωφροσύνην ἐνδεδειγμένους. (b) *ib.* 43-46 ἀπάντων δὲ οὖν ἐφρόντιζον τῶν πολιτῶν, μάλιστα δὲ τῶν νεωτέρων . . . ἀπαντας μὲν οὖν ἐπὶ τὰς αὐτὰς ἀγεῖν διατριβὰς οὐχ οἶόν τ' ἦν, ἀνωμάλως τὰ περὶ τὸν βίον ἔχοντας· ὡς δὲ πρὸς τὴν οὐσίαν ἤρμωσεν, οὕτως ἐκάστοις προσέταττον . . . καὶ ταῦτα νομοθετήσαντες οὐδὲ τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον ὀλιγώρουν, ἀλλὰ διελόμενοι τὴν μὲν πόλιν κατὰ κώμας, τὴν δὲ χώραν κατὰ δήμους, ἐθεώρουν τὸν βίον τὸν ἐκάστου, καὶ τοὺς ἀκοσμοῦντας ἀνήγον εἰς τὴν βουλὴν· ἡ δὲ τοὺς μὲν ἐνουθέτει, τοὺς δ' ἤπειλει, τοὺς δ' ὡς προσῆκεν ἐκόλαζεν. (c) Athen. 4, 65, p. 168 A: ὅτι δὲ τοὺς ἀσώτους καὶ τοὺς μὴ ἐκ τινος περιουσίας ζῶντας τὸ παλαιὸν ἀνεκαλοῦντο οἱ Ἀρεοπαγῖται καὶ ἐκόλαζον, ἰστόρησαν Φανόδημος

(325 F 10) και Φιλόχορος (328 F 196) ἄλλοι τε πλείους. (II a) Aristot. *Pol.* 2, 9, 2 Σόλωνα δ' ἐνοι μὲν οἴονται νομοθέτην γενέσθαι σπουδαῖον· δι-  
 γαρχίαν τε γὰρ καταλύσαι λίαν ἄκρατον οὔσαν, και δουλεύοντα τὸν δῆμον παῦ-  
 5 εἶναι γὰρ τὴν μὲν ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ βουλὴν διλιγαρχικόν, τὸ δὲ τὰς ἀρχὰς  
 αἰρετὰς ἀριστοκρατικόν, τὰ δὲ δικαστήρια δημοτικόν. ἔοικε δὲ Σόλων ἐκεῖνα μὲν  
 ὑπάρχοντα πρότερον οὐ καταλύσαι, τὴν τε βουλὴν και τὴν τῶν ἀρχῶν αἵρεσιν,  
 τὸν δὲ δῆμον καταστήσαι τὰ δικαστήρια ποιήσας ἐκ πάντων. (3) διὸ και  
 μέμφονται τινες αὐτῷ· λῦσαι γὰρ θάτερον, κύριον ποιήσαντα τὸ δικαστήριον  
 10 πάντων, κληρωτῶν δν. ἐπεὶ γὰρ τοῦτ' ἴσχυσεν, ὥσπερ τυράνῳ τῷ δήμῳ χαρι-  
 ζόμενοι τὴν πολιτείαν εἰς τὴν νῦν δημοκρατίαν κατέστησαν· και τὴν μὲν ἐν Ἀρεί-  
 ῳ πάγῳ βουλὴν Ἐφιάλτης ἐκόλουσε και Περικλῆς, τὰ δὲ δικαστήρια μισθοφόρα  
 κατέστησε Περικλῆς, και τοῦτον δὴ τὸν τρόπον ἕκαστος τῶν δημαγωγῶν προήγα-  
 γεν αὐξων εἰς τὴν νῦν δημοκρατίαν. (4) φαίνεται δ' οὐ κατὰ τὴν Σόλωνος γενέσθαι  
 15 τοῦτο προαίρεσιν, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ἀπὸ συμπτώματος· τῆς ναυαρχίας γὰρ ἐν τοῖς  
 Μηδικοῖς ὁ δῆμος αἷτιος γενόμενος ἐφρονηματίσθη και δημαγωγούς ἔλαβε φαύ-  
 λους, ἀντιπολιτευομένων τῶν ἐπεικῶν· ἐπεὶ Σόλων γε ἔοικε τὴν ἀναγκαιοτάτην  
 ἀποδιδόναι τῷ δήμῳ δύναμιν, τὸ τὰς ἀρχὰς αἰρεῖσθαι και εὐθύνειν (μηδὲ γὰρ  
 20 τοῦτου κύριος ἂν ὁ δῆμος δούλος ἂν εἴη και πολέμιος), τὰς δ' ἀρχὰς ἐκ τῶν γνωρί-  
 μων και τῶν εὐπόρων κατέστησε πάσας, ἐκ τῶν πεντακοσιομεδίμων και ζευγι-  
 τῶν και τρίτου τέλους τῆς καλουμένης ἱπάδος· τὸ δὲ τέταρτον θητικόν, οἷς  
 οὐδεμιᾶς ἀρχῆς μετῆν. (b) Aristot. Ἀθπ. 3, 6 (in the ἀρχαία πολιτεία ἢ πρὸ  
 Δράκοντος) ἢ δὲ τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν βουλή τὴν μὲν τάξιν εἶχε τοῦ διατηρεῖν τοὺς  
 νόμους, διώκει δὲ τὰ πλείστα και τὰ μέγιστα τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει, και κολάζουσα και  
 25 ζημιούσα πάντας τοὺς ἀκοσμοῦντας κυρίως· ἢ γὰρ αἵρεσις τῶν ἀρχόντων ἀριστί-  
 δην και πλουτινὴν ἦν, ἐξ ὧν οἱ Ἀρεοπαγῖται καθίσταντο <sup>1)</sup>). (c) *Ib.* 4, 4 (the  
 constitution of 'Drakon') ἢ δὲ βουλή ἢ ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου φύλαξ ἦν τῶν νόμων  
 και διετήρει τὰς ἀρχὰς, ὅπως κατὰ τοὺς νόμους ἀρχῶσιν· ἐξῆν δὲ τῷ ἀδικουμένῳ  
 πρὸς τὴν τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν βουλὴν εἰσαγγέλλειν, ἀποφαίνοντι παρ' ὃν ἀδικεῖται  
 30 νόμον. (d) *Ib.* 8, 1-2 τὰς δ' ἀρχὰς ἐποίησε (Solon) κληρωτὰς ἐκ προκρίτων... <sup>2)</sup>  
 τὸ γὰρ ἀρχαῖον ἢ ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ βουλή, ἀνακαλεσαμένη και κρίνασα καθ'  
 αὐτήν, τὸν ἐπιτήδειον ἐφ' ἐκάστη τῶν ἀρχῶν ἐπ' ἐνιαυτὸν διατάξασα ἀπέστει-  
 λεν. (e) *Ib.* 8, 4 βουλὴν δ' ἐποίησε (Solon) τετρακοσίους, ἐκάτὸν ἐξ ἐκάστης φυ-  
 λῆς· τὴν δὲ τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν ἔταξεν ἐπὶ τὸ νομοφυλακεῖν, ὥσπερ ὑπῆρχεν και  
 35 πρότερον ἐπίσκοπος οὔσα τῆς πολιτείας, και τὰ τε ἄλλα τὰ πλείστα και τὰ μέγι-  
 στα τῶν πολιτικῶν <sup>3)</sup> διετήρει, και τοὺς ἀμαρτάνοντας ἠθύνεν κυρία οὔσα και  
 ζημιούη και κολάζειν, και τὰς ἐκτίσεις ἀνέφερον εἰς πόλιν, οὐκ ἐπιγράφουσα τὴν  
 πρόφασιν δι' ὃ τὸ ἐκτίνεσθαι (?) <sup>4)</sup>, και τοὺς ἐπὶ καταλύσει τοῦ δήμου συνιστα-  
 μένους ἔκρινεν, Σόλωνος θέντος νόμον εἰσαγγελίας <sup>5)</sup> περὶ αὐτῶν. (f) Plutarch.

*Solon* 19 συστησάμενος δὲ τὴν ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ βουλὴν ἐκ τῶν κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἀρχόντων, ἧς διὰ τὸ ἀρξαι καὶ αὐτὸς μετείχεν, ἔτι δ' ὄρων τὸν δῆμον οἰδοῦντα καὶ θρασυνόμενον τῇ τῶν χρεῶν ἀφέσει, δευτέραν προσκατένευε βουλὴν ἀπὸ φυλῆς ἐκάστης . . . οὐς προβουλεύειν ἔταξε τοῦ δήμου καὶ μηδὲν ἔαν ἀπροβούλευτον εἰς ἐκκλησίαν εἰσφέρεισθαι. (2) τὴν δ' ἄνω βουλὴν ἐπίσκοπον πάντων καὶ φύλακα <sup>6</sup>) τῶν νόμων ἐκάθισεν, οἰόμενος ἐπὶ δυσὶ βουλαῖς ὡσπερ ἀγκύραις ὁμοῦσαν ἦρτον ἐν σάλῳ τὴν πόλιν ἔσεσθαι καὶ μᾶλλον ἀτρεμοῦντα τὸν δῆμον παρέξειν. (3) οἱ μὲν οὖν πλείστοι τὴν ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλὴν ὡσπερ εἰρηται Σόλωνα συστήσασθαι φασί· καὶ μαρτυρεῖν αὐτοῖς δοκεῖ μάλιστα τὸ μηδαμοῦ τὸν Δράκοντα λέγειν μηδ' ὀνομάζειν Ἀρεοπαγίτας, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἐφέταις αἰεὶ διαλέγεσθαι περὶ τῶν φοινικῶν. (4) ὁ δὲ τρισκαίδέκατος ἄξων τοῦ Σόλωνος τὸν δγδοον ἔχει τῶν νόμων οὕτως αὐτοῖς ὀνόμασι γεγραμμένον· « Ἀτίμων ὅσοι ἀτιμοὶ ἦσαν πρὶν ἢ Σόλωνα ἀρξαι ἐπίτιμους εἶναι, πλὴν ὅσοι ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου ἢ ὅσοι ἐκ τῶν ἐφετῶν ἢ ἐκ πρυτανείου καταδικασθέντες ὑπὸ τῶν βασιλέων ἐπὶ φόνῳ ἢ σφαγαῖσιν ἢ ἐπὶ τυραννίδι ἔφυγον <sup>7</sup>) » δτε ὁ θεσμὸς ἐφάνη ὀδε». (5) ταῦτα δὲ πάλιν ὡς πρὸ τῆς Σόλωνος ἀρχῆς καὶ νομοθεσίας τὴν ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλὴν οὔσαν ἐνδείκνυται. τίνες γὰρ ἦσαν οἱ πρὸ Σόλωνος ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ καταδικασθέντες, εἰ πρῶτος Σόλων ἔδωκε τῇ ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλήι τὸ κρίνειν; <sup>8</sup>) (IIIa) Pollux 8, 117 δικαστήρια Ἀθήνησιν. Ἀρειος πάγος· ἐδίκαζε δὲ φόνου καὶ τραύματος ἐκ προνοίας καὶ πυρκαϊᾶς καὶ φαρμάκων, ἔαν τις ἀποκτείνῃ δούς. ἐγένετο δὲ διωμοσία, καὶ μετὰ τὴν διωμοσίαν κρίσις. προοιμιάζεσθαι δὲ οὐκ ἐξῆν, οὐδὲ οἰκτιζεσθαι. μετὰ δὲ τὸν πρότερον λόγον ἐξῆν φυγεῖν, πλὴν εἰ τις γονέας εἴη ἀπεκτονῶς. καθ' ἕκαστον δὲ μῆνα τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἐδίκαζον ἐφεξῆς, τετάρτη φθινότος, τρίτη, δευτέρα. (118) οἱ δ' ἑνέα ἀρχοντες οἱ καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν μετὰ τὸ δοῦναι τὰς εὐθύνας αἰεὶ τοῖς Ἀρεοπαγίταις προσετίθεντο. ὑπάιθριοι δ' ἐδίκαζον. φόνου δὲ ἐξῆν ἐπεξιέναι μέχρις ἀνεψιῶν, καὶ ἐν τῷ ὄρκῳ ἐπερωτᾶν τίς προσήκων ἐστὶ τῷ τεθνεῶτι. κἂν οἰκέτης ἦι, ἐπισκήπτειν συγκεχώρηται. (b) *id.* 8, 125 ἐφέται τὸν μὲν ἀριθμὸν εἰς καὶ πενήντα, Δράκων δ' αὐτοὺς κατέστησεν ἀριστίνδην αἰρεθέντας, ἐδίκαζον δὲ τοῖς ἐφ' αἵματι διωκομένοις ἐν τοῖς πέντε δικαστήριοις. Σόλων δ' αὐτοῖς προσκατέστησε τὴν ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλὴν. κατὰ μικρὰ δὲ ἤκατεγελάσθη τὸ τῶν ἐφετῶν δικαστήριον. (IVa) Aristot. Ἀθπ. 23, 1 τότε μὲν οὖν μέχρι τούτου προῆλθεν ἡ πόλις, ἅμα τῇ δημοκρατίῳ κατὰ μικρὸν αὐξανομένης <sup>9</sup>)· μετὰ δὲ τὰ Μηδικὰ πάλιν ἰσχυροῦσεν ἡ ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ βουλή καὶ διώκει τὴν πόλιν, οὐδενὶ δόγματι λαβοῦσα τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ γενέσθαι τῆς περὶ Σαλαμίνα ναυμαχίας αἰτία· τῶν γὰρ στρατηγῶν ἐξαπορησάντων τοῖς πράγμασι καὶ κηρυξάντων σώζειν ἕκαστον ἑαυτὸν, πορίσασα δραχμὰς ἐκάστῳ <sup>10</sup>) ὁκτὼ δὲ ἔδωκε καὶ ἐνεβίβασεν εἰς τὰς ναῦς. (2) διὰ ταύτην δὲ τὴν αἰτίαν παρεχώρουν αὐτῆς τῷ ἀξιώματι <sup>11</sup>), καὶ ἐπολιτεύθησαν Ἀθηναῖοι καλῶς καὶ <sup>12</sup>) κατὰ τούτους

τοὺς καιροῦς. (b) Cicero *De off.* I, 74 *sed cum plerique arbitrentur res bellicas maiores esse quam urbanas, minuenda est haec opinio...* (75) *quamvis enim Themistocles iure laudetur et sit eius nomen quam Solonis illustrius citeturque Salamis clarissimae testis victoriae, quae anteponatur*  
 5 *consilio Solonis ei quo primum constituit Areopagitas, non minus praeclarum hoc quam illud iudicandum est: illud enim semel profuit, hoc semper proderit civitati. hoc consilio leges Atheniensium, hoc maiorum instituta servantur; et Themistocles quidem nihil dixerit in quo ipse Areopagum adiuverit, at ille vere < a > se adiutum Themistoclem: est enim bellum*  
 10 *gestum consilio senatus eius, qui a Solone erat constitutus.* (c) Aristot. Ἰθπ. 25, 2 ἐπειτα τῆς βουλῆς ἐπὶ Κόνωνος ἀρχοντος (462/1 B.C.) ἅπαντα περιεῖλε (scil. Ἐφιάλτης) τὰ ἐπιθετα δι' ὧν ἦν ἡ τῆς πολιτείας φυλακὴ, καὶ τὰ μὲν τοῖς πεντακοσίοις, τὰ δὲ τῶι δήμῳ καὶ τοῖς δικαστηρίοις ἀπέδωκεν<sup>13</sup>).  
 (d) Lex. Cantabr. s.v. νομοφύλακες. . . . κατέστησαν, ὡς Φιλόχορος (328  
 15 F 64), ὅτε Ἐφιάλτης μόνα κατέλιπε τῆι ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλῆι τὰ ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος.

I have given the relevant passages in full and arranged them in order to bring into prominence at once the difference between Isokrates, Phanodemus, and Philochoros (so far as the two last named agree with  
 20 the orator<sup>14</sup>) on the one side, and Aristotle, (Philochoros), A. on the other. Isokrates draws a picture of the educational activity<sup>15</sup> of the Areopagos which we may call idealizing, at any rate it is definitely un-historical and does not even touch upon the actual functions of the old Council; it is, at least for the present, of no importance how far Isokrates  
 25 was acquainted with those functions, or whether the idealized dressing up of the naked economic interests of the propertied classes came from himself or from earlier discussions<sup>16</sup>). Phanodemus, the assistant of Lykurgos in the reactionary or archaizing reforms, and Philochoros copied the picture of Isokrates, either fully or confining themselves to  
 30 the fundamental social question which greatly troubled the Athenian statesmen in the fourth century after the loss of the empire, and continuously in subsequent times. For Isokrates too this question, viz. the situation, or (to express his line of thought more accurately) the claims of the poorer classes, constituted the point of departure for the 'education-  
 35 al' activity of the Areopagos: εἰδότες τὰς ἀπορίας μὲν διὰ τὰς ἀργίας γιγνομένης, τὰς δὲ κακουργίας διὰ τὰς ἀπορίας κτλ.<sup>17</sup>). It is possible that the Atthidographers gave some historical reality to the imaginative picture of Isokrates: the activities of the Areopagos, as described by the orator, could be regarded as the precedent for the alleged νόμος ἀργίας

of Solon <sup>18</sup>), and they thus obtained some historical probability. Aristotle did not repeat that unhistorical description; he mentioned the social activities of the Areopagos so far only as he evidently knew about the *cura morum* ascribed to the old Council, and this task may possibly be found also in F 3 of A. <sup>19</sup>). Aristotle endeavoured to outline the true position of the old Council in the constitution and to determine its functions which had not the same extent at all times, even apart from the reform of Ephialtes, who took from the Areopagos *ἀπαντα τὰ ἐπιθετα*, leaving for it only jurisdiction in cases of homicide <sup>20</sup>). Of course, he had no documentary tradition for the time before Solon. So far as he could not base his account upon general remembrance he inferred the position of the Areopagos from the laws of Solon and from psephisms which limited its activity directly or indirectly by introducing other magistrates not dependent on the Areopagos <sup>21</sup>). Moreover, he used stories like that occurring in the *Atthis* of A. about a *ἡγεμονία* of the Areopagos from 480-463 B.C. <sup>22</sup>). The result was that the old Council was the real governing body before Solon, and also the body which exercised the entire jurisdiction <sup>23</sup>). In Aristotle's opinion the alterations wrought by the legislation of Solon were in this respect relatively unimportant: the Areopagos retained the *νομοφυλακία*, which actually cannot have existed before written laws existed, *i.e.* before Drakon <sup>24</sup>). It continued to have the supervision of *τὰ πλεῖστα καὶ τὰ μέγιστα τῶν πολιτικῶν*, and the jurisdiction; Aristotle mentions especially that it had to protect the constitution from the threat of overthrow by a tyrant <sup>25</sup>). In his opinion it was Ephialtes who deprived the Areopagos of all these functions and gave them to other bodies, *viz.* the Council of the Five Hundred, the Assembly, the Courts of Law.

We cannot distinguish the shares of A. and Philochoros in F 3-4, but Philochoros may actually have taken the same line as A. <sup>26</sup>). In any case there is no doubt that the two *Atthidographers* must be grouped with Aristotle, not with Isokrates; we may again for the present omit as irrelevant the question as to how far Aristotle himself was dependent on A. or shared his opinion <sup>27</sup>). The difficulty is less that we are informed about A. and Philochoros by a late author only, who was a stranger to these matters and without great understanding, than that the report of this author, after having passed through many hands, was confined to the judicial activities of the Areopagos. This point was certainly not unimportant for the critics of the fourth century, but one point only out of many, and not the most important. However, the particular interest

in that function of the Areopagos gives us a clue as to the source: the commentator on Dionysios Areopagita <sup>28</sup>) of course looked up neither A. nor Philochoros, although the latter was preserved longer (even if only in the Epitome); he consulted for the institution of the Areopagos, which for his purpose was of secondary importance, the ordinary handbook(s), in which the courts for homicide of Athens were treated. This handbook evidently gave the same detailed account which is at the bottom of Pollux (III), the Patmian Scholia on Demosthenes, Pausanias, and others <sup>29</sup>), and which presumably derives ultimately from Theophrastos <sup>30</sup>). It may have been Theophrastos himself, or one of the writers using him (these details are of no great consequence), who cited the Atthidographers, who often had an occasion for speaking of the Areopagos. Philochoros at least may have fully described the external form of procedure which is of course not impossible for A. either; as I mentioned above we cannot distinguish what belongs to each. They certainly discussed the sphere of the Areopagite criminal jurisdiction; and since A. did so in the first book (F 3) he must have mentioned the restrictions by the people's courts and the (earlier) *ἐφῆται*. They further must have discussed (A. on the occasion of the legislation of Solon because of F 4 and Aristotle) the qualification of the Areopagitai <sup>31</sup>), the composition of the court from the past archons, the proportion of Areopagitai and ephetai when members were appointed for the homicidal courts. It is regrettable that Pollux touched on this point very succinctly (he seems in agreement with the *πλεῖστοι* to have taken the Areopagos to be Solonian and the ephetai to be earlier, *i.e.* not Areopagitai); and Maximus utterly confused the two institutions (if his text is in order) <sup>32</sup>). But I think we must understand matters according to Pollux (III b): the legislation of Solon constituted an epoch in the development of the Areopagos in the accounts of Aristotle and A. too. Our problem is, which alterations concerning the Areopagos A. (or Philochoros) ascribed to Solon. Did he, like Aristotle, merely believe that the legislator newly outlined the functions of the old Council, while he regulated by law its composition, enacting the annual addition of the nine archons? <sup>33</sup>) Or did A. regard the Areopagos altogether as a creation of Solon? An answer in the affirmative would mean, in either case, that there was an important difference of view between A. and Aristotle in regard to the Areopagos, for the latter regarded as pre-Solonian both the Areopagos and its being composed of past archons <sup>34</sup>). If so, Aristotle actually would have tacitly corrected not 'the tradition of the Atthis' <sup>35</sup>), but the view

of A. as he did the latter's interpretation of the *σεισάχθεια* <sup>36</sup>). The decision of this question is by no means simple. Plutarch (II f) mentions as the opinion of the *πλείστοι* that the Areopagos was a creation of Solon. His arguments *pro* and *contra* are equally of no value <sup>37</sup>), and it is not our task to enter into the discussion of the facts concerning the age of the Areopagos, which is now almost universally agreed to be the old Council of the nobility, perhaps reaching back to the period of the kings. Our primary question is how old the discussion is, and who are meant by the *πλείστοι*. I am by no means so certain as Wilamowitz <sup>38</sup>) and others <sup>10</sup> that the discussion began before Aristotle, if only because I can hardly believe that he would not even have mentioned a conflict of opinions on such a fundamental point, when he recorded so many relatively unimportant variants in the history of Solon and the Peisistratids. Further, the discussion was carried on with arguments which imply as existing <sup>15</sup> at least the work of Theophrastos *Περὶ νόμων*, but probably also the special writings about the Axones, one of which, it is true, bears the name of Aristotle <sup>39</sup>). The discussion is known to us from Plutarch, whose source for ch. 19 is almost certainly not Hermippos, but Didymos' *Περὶ τῶν ἀξόνων τῶν Σόλωνος ἀντιγραφή πρὸς Ἀσκληπιάδην* <sup>40</sup>). The first <sup>20</sup> supporter of the Solonian origin of the Areopagos whom we can prove with certainty, is the source of Cicero (IV b), *i.e.* almost certainly Panaitios. Those who venture to infer from Pollux (III b) that Theophrastos previously supported this thesis cannot be strictly refuted, improbable though it appears to me to make this inference from a source which <sup>25</sup> treats the judicial activities of the Areopagos in *historical* times alone. In no case must we maintain on the strength of the passages of Isokrates quoted above (I ab), which are deliberately vague as to all dates and facts, that the orator 'assumes the Areopagos not to have been instituted until Solon', not to mention the subsequent assertion that 'he followed <sup>30</sup> an *Atthis* in this assumption' <sup>41</sup>). According to *our* sources it must remain uncertain who first declared Solon to be the creator of the Areopagos, but in my opinion everything favours the suggestion that Aristotle not only did not share this view, but did not even know it. The problem becomes even more complicated by the fact that the discussion, of which <sup>35</sup> Plutarch gives us an account, is concerned not only with the institution or the composition (*συστήσασθαι*) of the Areopagos, but also with the question as to who entrusted it with its jurisdiction (*τὸ κρῖνειν*). Pollux deals with the judicial activity of the Areopagos alone; and as the source of Plutarch (Didymos) in the bringing in of the ephetai <sup>42</sup>) agrees

with the writings about the *δικαστήρια* we must seriously consider whether it was Plutarch who in his too succinct treatment of the institution confused the three separate questions about the institution of the Areopagos, its being composed of past archons (probably in consequence of an enactment of Solon <sup>43</sup>), and the relations between the Areopagos and the ephetai. He anyhow excerpted from an author interested in matters of law or antiquities, not in politics. The starting-point of the failure to understand may even be the outline of the functions of the Areopagos in the description of the Solonian constitution by Aristotle, if one inferred from this that the old Council was entrusted with one duty only, that of *νομοφυλακία*, the same which the constitution of 'Drakon' (II c) assigned to it <sup>44</sup>.

Let us assume *argumenti causa* that even before Aristotle some writers assigned to Solon the institution of the Areopagos, and that there was among the *πλείστοι* a pre-Aristotelian Attidographer. This could only have been a democrat <sup>45</sup>, and thus Kleidemos alone comes into the discussion. The assumption could not easily be made to accord with the general old legend about the institution, which was probably found in all *Attides* (with the exception perhaps of A.), and in regard to which poets, orators, and historians agree, *viz.* that the Areopagos was the court for homicide instituted in primeval times <sup>46</sup>. It is not very credible that Kleidemos should have abandoned this title to glory of Athens. But it does appear credible that on this point too our poor tradition cut down and simplified the complicated questions. What interested the democrat in the discussion about the Areopagos was not its existence, but its political power which was due to the *ἐπιθετα*, and these may be very old but are not originally the business of a homicide court <sup>47</sup>. One might imagine that Kleidemos, although not assigning to Solon the institution of the Areopagos, stressed the point that he left its full power to that body, and that it was Ephialtes only who deprived it of the *ἐπιθετα*. Such an argument would be similar to that of Aristotle in *Politics* (II a) which he wrote before he knew the *Atthis* of A., but of course with a different opinion about the *ἐπιθετα*. Kleidemos then reproached Solon with having left unchanged the 'oligarchic' government, while the oligarchic critics of Solon reproached him with having in fact destroyed the position of the Areopagos by instituting the *δικαστήρια*. Conversely we might imagine that A., the champion of the Areopagos as the ruling body, altogether neglected the mythical legend of the institution <sup>48</sup>. He may have dated the Areopagos down to Solon, starting from the



purely political consideration that it was easier to recommend and to defend the institution as part of the *πάτριος πολιτεία* if it was a creation of the 'democratic' reformer Solon. That would mean, he gave a historical account of what Isokrates in the *Areopagitikos* left deliberately vague <sup>49</sup>).

5 But this conjecture is contradicted by the facts that A. dealt with the Areopagos in his first *and* in his second book, that in F 3 the number of the book cannot be altered easily, and that a treatment of Solon in the first book is extremely improbable <sup>50</sup>). We can hardly judge the connexion between F 3 and F 4 (scanty though the former is) differently from the

10 same phenomenon in Philochoros, who also discussed the Areopagos in two different books <sup>51</sup>). Taking these points into account we may be more inclined to assume that in these matters A. took the same view as Aristotle in *Politics* (and actually as Isokrates too). This view would be that—differing perhaps from Kleidemos and from the 'oligarchic' opponents

15 of Solon in Aristotle—he regarded the preservation of the Areopagos as a wise measure of Solon who created the *πάτριος πολιτεία* as the ideal mixed constitution. This again would agree with the ideas of Isokrates, and the conception would be in harmony with the nature and the political attitude of the *μέσος πολίτης* A. I am afraid that we can get no further

20 than this, our tradition being what it is. But it is certain for Aristotle, and probable for A., that they were *not* among the *πλείστοι* of Plutarch.

(5) The lexicographer is citing Aristotle for the functions, A. for the history of the office. Clearly and distinctly he gives as the view of A. 'that Kleisthenes abolished the *kolakretai* and replaced them by the

25 *apodektai*' <sup>1</sup>). The first statement is certainly, the second almost certainly, wrong. The inscriptions <sup>2</sup>) prove that the *kolakretai* until at least 416/5 B.C. not only 'had funds from which they were quite well able to pay', but were, as we may say, 'the financial officials of the state who had under them the treasury of the state, or the city, proper' <sup>3</sup>). An ancient author

30 calls them succinctly and clearly *ταμίαι τῶν πολιτικῶν χρημάτων* <sup>4</sup>), and this designation delimits their activity both from that of the *ταμίαι τῶν ἱερῶν χρημάτων* <sup>5</sup>) and from that of the administration of the treasury of the Empire, the *Ἑλληνοταμίαι*. The *kolakretai* disbursed the money for the buildings of ships and of temples, the embassies to festivals, the

35 maintenances in the Prytaneion, public notifications, the payment of the judges (which some writers assumed to be their only disbursement <sup>6</sup>)), and other items, all of them matters which, at least in the fifth century, were no concern of the Areopagos but of the Council. The extent of these functions, which touch upon all domains of political life, fully justifies

the conception of their administering *the* treasury of the State. If the reform of Kleisthenes signifies anything in the history of this office it was that he made them subject to his Council <sup>7)</sup> with the consequence that the extent of their activities naturally increased with those of the Council. If Kleisthenes really introduced the ἀποδέκται, as is still widely assumed <sup>8)</sup>, he put them not in the place, but at the side of the kolakretai, as a kind of assistant officials who had to attend to the collecting of the money and to the payment of it into the main treasury. We may infer that from both their name and their activities as described by Aristotle. For the apodektai never had a treasury of their own; they were a board for making and entering accounts, agents who formed the connexion between those who were obliged to pay and the treasury of the State, general receivers, as they have sometimes been called <sup>9)</sup>. But the supposition that so early a statesman as Kleisthenes created such an elaborate organization of financial matters <sup>10)</sup> is contradicted, apart from general considerations, by the fact that the apodektai do not appear in the inscriptions until 418/7 B.C. <sup>11)</sup>, while the kolakretai were really abolished in 411/0 B.C. <sup>12)</sup>. Keil inferred from these dates that the apodektai 'were an institution of the later Periclean period' <sup>13)</sup>. I should prefer to date them even later, not only because the inscriptions do not begin until after the Peace of Nicias but also because the exhaustion of finances by the long war makes the creation of a special board for entering and collecting revenues of the State appear particularly comprehensible. If this date is correct, the short government of the Four Hundred made a serious attempt at reforming financial affairs, and Democracy continued what had been begun <sup>14)</sup>.

It was necessary to present these facts at some length in order to prove that the alleged fragment of A. is historically wrong as it stands. It is quite understandable that Keil simply rejected it. But he ascribes to A. such gross ignorance as to the officials at the end of the fifth century <sup>15)</sup> as seems to be incredible even if one does not overrate either A.'s knowledge of documentary records <sup>16)</sup> or his interest in financial affairs <sup>17)</sup>. If nothing else, he must at least have known that it was Theramenes only and the Four Hundred, who abolished the kolakretai <sup>18)</sup> and reformed financial affairs. We therefore have to consider another possibility, which I (following Wilamowitz <sup>19)</sup>) believe to be self-evident, *viz.* that the excerptor(s) of Harpokration is to be blamed for the indisputable mistake: they transferred the verbatim quotation from Aristotle into indirect speech, thereby severely abbreviating it, and by condensing the quot-

ation from A. too they made nonsense of it. If that is so we do not know what A. really said, and it seems useless to speculate <sup>20</sup>). But on the basis of F 36 we can state definitely (and this is important also for general reasons) that A. did not systematically outline the functions of the kolakretai (or of the apodektai for that matter) as Aristotle did. And if the law which he cites comes from Kleisthenes himself or from his period, as seems to be the case <sup>21</sup>), F 36 simultaneously furnishes the proof that A. cannot have asserted that the kolakretai were abolished by Kleisthenes.

- 10 (6) Aristot. Ἀθπ. 22, 1 τούτων δὲ γενομένων δημοτικωτέρα πολὺ τῆς Σόλωνος ἐγένετο ἢ πολιτεία. καὶ γὰρ συνέβη τοὺς μὲν Σόλωνος νόμους ἀφανίσαι τὴν τυραννίδα διὰ τὸ μὴ χρῆσθαι, καινοὺς δ' ἄλλους θείνειν τὸν Κλεισθένη στοχαζόμενον τοῦ πλήθους, ἐν οἷς ἐτέθη καὶ ὁ περὶ τοῦ ὄστρακισμοῦ νόμος. . . .
- (3) ἔπει δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα δωδεκάτῳ νικῆσαντες τὴν ἐν Μαραθῶνι μάχην ἐπὶ  
 15 Φαινίππου ἄρχοντος (490/89 B.C.), διαλιπόντες ἔτη δύο μετὰ τὴν νίκην (488/7 B.C.), θαρροῦντος ἤδη τοῦ δήμου, τότε πρῶτον ἐχρήσαντο τῷ νόμῳ τῷ περὶ τὸν ὄστρακισμόν, ὃς ἐτέθη διὰ τὴν ὑποψίαν τῶν ἐν ταῖς δυνάμεσιν, ὅτι <sup>1</sup>) Πεισίστρατος δημαγωγὸς καὶ στρατηγὸς ὢν τύραννος κατέστη. (4) καὶ πρῶτος ὠστρακίσθη τῶν ἐκείνου συγγενῶν Ἴππαρχος Χάρμου Κολλυτεύς <sup>2</sup>),  
 20 δι' ὃν καὶ μάλιστα τὸν νόμον ἐθήκεν ὁ Κλεισθένης, ἐξελάσαι βουλόμενος αὐτόν. οἱ γὰρ Ἀθηναῖοι τοὺς τῶν τυράννων φίλους, ὅσοι μὴ συνεξαμαρτάνουεν ἐν ταῖς ταραχαῖς <sup>3</sup>), εἰὼν οἰκεῖν τὴν πόλιν, χρώμενοι τῇ εἰωθυίᾳ τοῦ δήμου πραιότητι ὧν ἡγεμῶν καὶ προστάτης ἦν Ἴππαρχος. The agreement in the wording of the report cited by Harpokration as A.s with the considerably fuller  
 25 discussion of Aristotle is as obvious as their divergence in the dating of the law: Aristotle states that the Athenians applied the law enacted by Kleisthenes (*i.e.* 508/7 B.C.) for the first time in 488/7 B.C.; A. states that the law was not enacted until that year, and he accentuates the statement—τοῦ νόμου τότε πρῶτον τεθέντος. The motives seem to fit  
 30 both datings: the general reason taken from the political situation after the victory of Marathon by which the Demos gained confidence in itself (to render the term θαρρεῖν for the present in the sense which conveys neither praise nor blame), and the special reason that Hipparchos, son of Charmos, had become suspect to the people as a relative of the family  
 35 of the tyrants <sup>4</sup>). There has been no lack of attempts at removing this contradiction between Aristotle and A. (who is mostly assumed to be the source of the former <sup>5</sup>)) by alterations of the text or by re-interpretations of the article of Harpokration. In my opinion we need not be detained by these attempts: there is always the possibility of a citation being

curtailed in a lexicon repeatedly abbreviated, or even of the lexicographer himself having failed to understand his source <sup>6</sup>). But the various suggestions <sup>7</sup>) are arbitrary, and in particular lacking in method, because their authors did not begin by asking whether the view which Harpokration ascribes to A. is really impossible—impossible of course not in itself and historically, but as an opinion of A. There can be no doubt of the opinion of Aristotle, because he pronounces it twice and gives the reasons for it twice: he explains not only why Kleisthenes enacted the law, but also why it was not applied for twenty years <sup>8</sup>). Moreover the view of Aristotle was the general opinion supported by Philochoros <sup>9</sup>) as well as by Ephoros, who follows an early Attidographer, either Hellanikos or Kleidemos <sup>10</sup>). We therefore must ask whether A. can have had a reason for contesting this general view. The answer is definitely in the affirmative: ancient historians universally regard ostracism as a typically democratic institution, which took its origin from the suspicion (or the envy) felt by the Demos towards the privileged classes <sup>11</sup>). Anybody seeing in Kleisthenes not the father of radical democracy but the restorer of the Solonian, the man whose constitution was οὐ δημοτικὴ ἀλλὰ παραπλησία τῇ Σόλωνος <sup>12</sup>), would wish to dissociate him from that radically democratic institution as he dissociated Solon from the revolutionary measure of a complete cancelling of all debts <sup>13</sup>); and, in fact, this was A.'s conception of Kleisthenes and the conception upheld in the circle of Theramenes and supported by Isokrates <sup>14</sup>). It must remain an open question whether A. burdened the Demos itself with the institution, using in the sentence θαρροῦντος ἤδη τοῦ δήμου the verb with an unfavourable connotation, or whether he ascribed it to a particular democratic leader, Themistokles for choice <sup>15</sup>). Considering the absence of a documentary foundation <sup>16</sup>) the former alternative is perhaps more likely. But there can be no doubt that A. saw in the introduction of ostracism, and, of course, in the law of the following year 487/6 B.C., which introduced the appointment of the archons by lot instead of by election <sup>17</sup>), the first steps on the inclined plane which led to the dethronement of the Areopagos by Ephialtes in 462/1 B.C. The deterioration was interrupted for a brief space of time by the 'hegemony' which the Areopagos regained after the battle of Salamis, not by a law or a psephism, but by its merits as author of that victory, and which lasted until 462/1 B.C. <sup>18</sup>). That, as we have seen <sup>19</sup>), is an obvious construction in opposition to which the democrats ascribed this very merit to Themistokles. The contradiction between 'Ath. 23, 1 and *Pol.* 2, 9, 2 ff. <sup>20</sup>) proves that Aristotle

adopted that construction from the *Atthis* of A., which had meanwhile been published; in any case, we thus obtain the essential lines of the picture drawn by A. of the development of the Athenian πολιτεία. For the relation between the two writers we get the result that Aristotle, who in the opening of ch. 22 accentuates the declaration that the constitution of Kleisthenes was δημοτικωτέρα πολὺ τῆς Σόλωνος, by no means 'has reproduced his source more or less verbatim' <sup>21</sup>). On the contrary, he corrected it here in exactly the same manner as he corrected A.'s conception of the seisachtheia. In both cases the correction signifies a refusal to accept the divergences of A. from the general opinion of Attidography (represented for Aristotle by Hellanikos, Kleidemos, and perhaps Phanodemos), and a rejection of doubts raised in the discussion which (as 'Ath. 29, 3 shows) reaches back at least to the time of the attempts at reform in 413/2-411/0 B.C. <sup>22</sup>). His criticism, which largely follows A. in the expressions <sup>23</sup>), is quite evident in the wording of §§ 3-4. Aristotle was obliged to explain why the law had not been applied for so long a time; he found the reason in the εἰωθυῖα πραιότης <sup>24</sup>) of the Demos because of which the attempts of Kleisthenes at expelling Hipparchos miscarried. That implies, if taken seriously, an attempted ostracism; we shall presently come back to this question, which is by no means simple. First we draw another inference. The whole nature of A.'s writing, especially his carefully considered re-interpretation of the seisachtheia, makes it appear impossible that he should have contested the general belief in the Kleisthenian origin of ostracism without arguments, even more that he should have done so in the teeth of documentary evidence. We must infer that there was as little documentary evidence for the introduction of ostracism as for the seisachtheia, which is known not to have appeared in the laws of Solon <sup>25</sup>). A. gave as his reason for his late dating the documentary fact in which both writers agree, *viz.* that the first ostracism was that of Hipparchos in the year 488/7 B.C. From this fact he drew a conclusion which may be right or wrong (I shall discuss this point too presently) as Aristotle drew the almost certainly wrong conclusion that ostracism was directed against the menace of tyranny.

<sup>35</sup> We have so far discussed the tradition about the introduction of ostracism. It shows incontestably two conceptions, *viz.* the general conception accepted by Aristotle that it was Kleisthenes who introduced ostracism, and another certainly supported (if not invented) by A., which dates the law twenty years later <sup>26</sup>). We now proceed to the histor-

ical question. If there was no documentary evidence for the enacting of the law, only some individual ostracisms being known from the eighties of the fifth century, beginning with the ostracism of Hipparchos in 488/7 B.C., we are free in forming our opinion. Nobody should fail to recognize that the point in question is of no small importance for our evaluation of Kleisthenes, and of definitely fundamental importance for our conception of the political development of Athens in the time after Kleisthenes. It is self-evident that within the limits of this commentary a historical question of such importance cannot be treated in due detail: to do so would involve a history of Athenian party affairs, a determination of the groups and the leading men wrestling with each other in home and in foreign policy, and an attempt at ascertaining their changing relations to each other<sup>27</sup>). We must content ourselves here with making evident what the tradition can contribute for deciding the historical question—a point of view which I have stressed again and again because it is too often neglected by modern historians in favour of their own considerations. The ostracism is almost an exemplary case in this respect. The situation itself is simple: the originally general assumption of the Kleisthenian origin of the law still has its supporters<sup>28</sup>), but it has lost much ground in consequence of Beloch's decided support of the later date<sup>29</sup>). The chief reasons of Beloch are (1) his assertion 'that such a weapon cannot be welded in order to leave it in its sheath for twenty years', (2) 'the clear testimony of Androtion'. The former reason must, of course, be considered, but, equally of course, it is not conclusive<sup>30</sup>); the second reason is altogether weak. The alleged testimony of A. is not a testimony but an inference: Beloch knows that<sup>31</sup>), but he did not state the point clearly, and did not allow for its implications. A. certainly did not draw his inference from the decree of amnesty in 481/0 B.C.<sup>32</sup>), as Seeck believed<sup>33</sup>): the decree would hardly have enumerated by their names all men ostracised between 490/89 and 481/0 B.C., and it would even less have given the dates of their exile. It is far more probable that A. built his inference (the political bias of which we showed above) on the fact that the ostracism of Hipparchos was the first known by records. We could further reason as follows: (1) the dates of the ostracisms enumerated in 'Aθπ. 22 can be taken solely from documentary records; (2) if the records from 490-481 B.C. (*i.e.* presumably the minutes of the town-clerk<sup>34</sup>)) were not burnt in 480 B.C., they may have been preserved from the accession to office of the first Council of the Five Hundred in 507/6 B.C.<sup>35</sup>), which would imply that the ostracism of

488/7 actually was the first; (3) if Megakles was ostracised in 487/6 B.C., and if the Athenians ἐπι ἔτη γ̄ (487/6-485/4 B.C.) τοὺς τῶν τυράνων φίλους ὠστράκιζον<sup>36</sup>), we may regard these events as the consequence of the alliance between the Peisistratids and the Alkmeonids at the time of the battle of Marathon<sup>37</sup>); (4) the law about ostracism in 488/7 B.C. and that about the appointment of the archons by lot in 487/6 B.C. sprang from the same democratic attitude of mind and are quite credible for the first years of the 'eighties<sup>38</sup>). All this is not a conclusive proof of the correctness of A.s inference, for the first application at this time of a law enacted by Kleisthenes might equally indicate the θαρρεῖν of the Demos and the δημοκρατία κατὰ μικρὸν ἀξιομένη<sup>39</sup>). But from the four points taken together one can make a fairly strong case for A. I doubt whether the same can be said in regard to the general opinion accepted by Aristotle in opposition to his chief authority A., unless the apparent emphasis in the opening words—ἐν οἷς ἐτέθη καὶ ὁ περὶ τοῦ ὠστρακισμοῦ νόμος—is considered to prove that the research in the archives made by the school<sup>40</sup>) had brought to light a document which put the Kleisthenian origin of the law beyond doubt. Otherwise the general opinion too cannot be regarded as anything more than an inference, or rather a syllogism quite correct for the science of that time: ostracism was a democratic institution; democratic institutions which are not Solonian must be Kleisthenian<sup>41</sup>); ostracism cannot be Solonian because it does not occur in the Axones. Another syllogism: Aristotle considers the *politikèia* of Kleisthenes to be 'much more democratic' than that of Solon<sup>42</sup>); he was well acquainted with the political bias of A. (as is shown by his rejection of A.s re-interpretation of the seisachtheia); he therefore has no reason for disputing the general opinion, and considers it safer to persist in it. This latter conception of Aristotle's attitude is in my opinion decidedly favoured by the contradiction in which he becomes involved by his criticism of A.: in § 1 he simply stated that Kleisthenes issued the law στοχαζόμενος τοῦ πλήθους (in agreement with his conception of the πολιτεία δημοτικωτέρα πολὺ), and he repeats the statement in § 3 maintaining that it ἐτέθη διὰ τὴν ὑποψίαν τῶν ἐν ταῖς δυνάμεσιν. But since he was obliged to explain why the law was not applied for twenty years the idea occurred to him that it was originally directed against tyranny, especially against a relative of Peisistratos, who was ἡγεμῶν καὶ προστάτης of the τῶν τυράνων φίλοι, and that the application had been till then prevented by the εἰλωθυῖα πραιότης τοῦ δήμου<sup>43</sup>). If we take these statements seriously they imply that the law about ostracism does not belong to the series of the

constitutional laws of 508/7 B.C., but to one of the years immediately following, when the attempt of Kleisthenes to come into contact with Persia had gravely shaken his position, and when the party of the Peisistratids in Athens tried to get, and actually seems to have got for some 5 years, the upper hand.

We thus come back to the point described above as not being simple. Herodt. 5, 73 concludes his report about the transactions with Persia, in which the name of the Alkmeonid Kleisthenes is deliberately omitted, with the mysterious words: οἱτοὶ μὲν δὴ ἀπελθόντες ἐς τὴν ἑωυτῶν αἰτίας 10 μεγάλας εἶχον <sup>44</sup>); the complete disappearance of Kleisthenes has always been a riddle in the Athenian history of the years after 508/7 B.C.; Aelian *V. H.* 13, 24 says that Κλεισθένης δὲ ὁ Ἀθηναῖος τὸ δεῖν ἐξοστρακίζεσθαι πρῶτος ἐσηγησάμενος αὐτὸς ἔτυχε τῆς καταδίκης πρῶτος. It is very tempting to connect the two statements, and E. M. Walker <sup>45</sup>) did not 15 venture to do so more confidently only because 'the authority is late and poor'. Actually the question is not about Aelian, but about his sources which often are sound and early, and the other contents of the chapter give no real cause for doubt <sup>46</sup>). I am by no means going to assert positively (if only because Philochoros seems to have agreed with Aristotle and 20 general opinion) that we can solve the problem of the divergent traditions by assuming that A.s inferred date is wrong, and that the criticism of Aristotle is right only in so far as Kleisthenes actually was the author of the law, though it would not belong to his reform of the constitution, being enacted in one of the following years <sup>47</sup>). It is at least conceivable 25 that Kleisthenes as προστάτης τοῦ δήμου invented this peculiar way of getting rid of political opponents in order to keep himself in power, a sort of *provocatio ad populum* which can best be compared with the modern *Referendum*. It is even conceivable that his policy in regard to Persia, and the indignation it roused in Athens, gave him or (rather?) 30 his opponents the occasion for applying the new measure, and that he was hoisted with his own petard. To sum up: our tradition does not allow of making a final decision between the dates of A. and Aristotle; but if anybody can determine the source of Aelian he may be able to solve the riddle.

35 (7) About this town, the name of which fluctuates between Θέλφουσα, Τέλφουσα, Θέλπουσα, Θάλπουσα in the inscriptions, on the coins, and in literature, see Hiller von Gaertringen *IG V 2 p. 101*; Ernst Meyer *RE VI A col. 1618*. I do not know on what occasion A. can have mentioned it in his second book *i.e.* between 594/3 (683/2) and 463/2 B.C., and I



think unlikely in his *Atthis* a learned digression on a matter of cult or etymology, although he seems to have had a certain interest in the latter <sup>1</sup>). Demeter Eleusinia (for ancient, in any case for Athenian, thinking 'Demeter of Eleusis' <sup>2</sup>) was worshipped in the Arcadian city, and the 5 form Δέλφουσα may suggest that A. assumed a connexion with Delphi, a place which naturally occurred often in the second book. Hiller <sup>3</sup>) hesitatingly thinks of the victory of the Thebans over the Lacedaemonians in 353/2 or 352/1 B.C. <sup>4</sup>), *i.e.* in the Sacred War, which A. certainly treated in detail. But that would imply the alteration in the number of 10 the book Β to Ζ, which is not a slight one.

(8) Pausan. I, 23, 10 <sup>1</sup>) τὰ δὲ ἐς Ἐρμόλυκον τὸν παγκρατιαστὴν καὶ Φορμίωνα τὸν Ἀσωπίχου <sup>2</sup>) γραψάντων ἐτέρων παρήμι, ἐς δὲ Φορμίωνα τὸ σόνδε ἔχω πλέον γράψαι. Φορμίωσι γὰρ τοῖς ἐπικίεσιν Ἀθηναίων ὄντι ὁμοίωι καὶ ἐς προγόνων δόξαν οὐκ ἀφανεῖ συνέβαινε ὀφείλειν χρέα. ἀναχωρήσας οὖν 15 ἐς τὸν Παιανία δῆμον ἐνταῦθα εἶχε δίαίταν, ἐς δὲ ναύαρχον αὐτὸν Ἀθηναίων αἰρουμένων ἐκπλεύσκεισθαι <sup>3</sup>) οὐκ ἔφασκεν· ὀφείλειν τε γάρ, καὶ οἱ πρὶν ἂν ἐκτίσῃ πρὸς τοὺς στρατιώτας οὐκ εἶναι παρέχεσθαι φρόνημα. οὕτως Ἀθηναῖοι — πάντως γὰρ ἐβούλοντο ἄρχειν Φορμίωνα — τὰ χρέα ὀπόσοις ὤφειλε διαλύουσι. Thukyd. 3, 7, 1 κατὰ δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον τοῦ θέρους τούτου (428 B.C.) Ἀθη- 20 ναῖοι καὶ περὶ Πελοπόννησον ναῦς ἀπέστειλαν τριάκοντα καὶ Ἀσώπιον τὸν Φορμίωνος στρατηγόν, κελυσάντων Ἀχαρνάνων τῶν Φορμίωνός τινα σφίσι πέμψαι ἢ υἷόν ἢ ξυγγενῆ ἄρχοντα. The end of the scholion is distorted by corruptions, the gravest of which Bergk removed by the slight and splendid conjecture ῥ μνάς instead of ῥάμνας. Boeckh <sup>4</sup>) explained the legal fiction, to 25 which the Athenians had recourse, by comparing the case of Demosthenes when he was called back from exile in 323 B.C. <sup>5</sup>): τῆς δὲ χρηματικῆς ζημίας αὐτῶι μενούσης — οὐ γὰρ ἐξῆν χάριτι λύσαι τὴν καταδίκην — ἐσοφίσαντο πρὸς τὸν νόμον· εἰωθότες γὰρ ἐν τῇ θυσίαι τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Σωτήρος ἀργύριον τελεῖν τοῖς κατασκευάζουσι καὶ κοσμοῦσι τὸν βωμόν, ἐκείνωι <sup>6</sup>) τότε ταῦτα ποιήσαι 30 καὶ παρασχεῖν πεντήκοντα ταλάντων ἐξέδωκαν, ὅσον ἦν τὸ τίμημα τῆς καταδίκης. For taking this action a psephism was required, which the nephew of Demosthenes, Demon, carried <sup>7</sup>). The case of Timotheos after his condemnation in 356/5 B.C. is similar <sup>8</sup>). These parallels allow us to accept the story which A. related of Phormion: there can hardly be a doubt 35 that the precedents were remembered in 355 (?) and in 323 B.C. In 428 B.C. also, a psephism must have been passed which was known to the Atthidographers. Phormion was appointed to provide what was necessary for an act of cult, and the refund for his expenditure was fixed at a sum that should cover the fine as well. Consequently αὐτόν must be

altered to αὐτῶι; the technical term ἀπομισθοῦν means the same as ἐκδιδόναι in Plutarch <sup>9</sup>). The corruption τοῦ Διονυσίου cannot be corrected with certainty, which is regrettable because otherwise we might perhaps be able to determine the calendar date of the psephism. Palaeographically <sup>5</sup> Dionysos certainly is more likely than Zeus <sup>10</sup>). When the *Taxiarchoi* of Eupolis brought Dionysos on the scene *μανθάνοντα παρὰ τῶι Φορμίῳ τοὺς τῶν στρατηγιῶν καὶ πολέμων νόμους*, the invention surely was determined by the case of Phormion <sup>11</sup>), but it does not prove that it was for a festival of Dionysos in particular that Phormion had to provide. It is <sup>10</sup> far more regrettable that the scholion is so incomplete (a point not sufficiently taken into account in the discussion). The scholiast on the *Peace*, which was acted in 421 B.C., *i.e.* a considerable time after the death of Phormion, looked the name up in the *Atthis* of A., where it occurred for the last time (the first reached when he unrolled the <sup>15</sup> book), as we may assume according to numerous parallels. He found under a certain year the story of Phormion's *atimia* and the removal of it in order to fulfill the wish of the Acarnanian embassy, which A. had simply entered as a historical fact <sup>12</sup>). Didymos no doubt copied both the date and the condemnation to a fine. These items are <sup>20</sup> now lacking, and it is merely a conjecture (even if a probable one) that the condemnation took place on the occasion of Phormion's rendering account of his last *strategia* <sup>13</sup>), while it remains uncertain (at least primarily) whether it was a real condemnation on account of his conduct as *strategos*, or simply a deficit in the funds, established when the accounts <sup>25</sup> were examined, and to be covered by the *strategos*. The difference in regard to our judgement on the events connected with the return of Phormion in the beginning of spring 428 B.C. is obvious <sup>14</sup>), although the legal consequence was the same in both cases: until the debt to the State was paid the political rights of the debtor ceased, and he remained <sup>30</sup> *ἀτιμος*; in the case of his death the *ἀτιμία* passed on to his son. The gaps in the scholion are not filled either by the mentions of Phormion in the comic poets, or by the account of Pausanias. The former fall in the time of 427-412 B.C.; but even in the earliest (the *Taxiarchoi* of Eupolis probably 427 B.C. and the *Babylonioi* of Aristophanes 426 B.C.) we have <sup>35</sup> no certain allusion to the trial, only the general praise of Phormion as a man of the good old-fashioned sort <sup>15</sup>). The frequency of the allusions in the 'twenties at the utmost allows of the inference that the peculiar 'indemnity' of Phormion, which evidently roused the special interest of the comic poets, had happened not very long ago, and we may therefore

confidently connect his trial with his last commands in the West in 430/29 and 429/8 B.C. <sup>16</sup>). The report of Pausanias, which is usually believed to derive from A. <sup>17</sup>), is almost without value because in the course of time it has lost all its distinctive features: there is no *εἶθυνα*, no *ἀτιμία*, no embassy, so that we do not understand why the Athenians are so keen on Phormion taking over the commandship. The form of the story shows that Pausanias inserted it himself; and if he did, the authority, as in similar cases, was late, perhaps of his own time, and knew so little of conditions in Athens as to call the Athenian general *ναύαρχος* (unless that is a stylistic affectation on the part of Pausanias). We might suggest as the source a collection of *Exempla (Facta et Dicta)* or even *Parallela*, for which the story would be suitable because of the resemblance to that of the Roman Cincinnatus. Nevertheless, Pausanias preserved one important fact: instead of the vague *ἐν ἀγρωὶ διέτριβεν* of the scholiast we are told that Phormion went to live in the deme Paiania. Now this may mean no more than that he had a house there <sup>18</sup>); but if we approve of Wade-Gery's supplements in the list of strategoi of I G<sup>2</sup> I 50, who in 439/8 B.C. swore to the peace with Samos <sup>19</sup>), the dispute is settled, and Paiania was the deme of Phormion, for the restoration of Phormion's name is very likely, and Paiania belongs to the Pandionis. However, there is one grave objection to this supplement: according to Thukydides <sup>20</sup>) Hagnon and Phormion were strategoi in the second year of the Samian War 440/39 B.C., and the former certainly belongs to the Pandionis. This tribe, which according to the full list in F 38 was re-  
<sup>25</sup> presented by Andokides in 441/0 B.C., would then have supplied two strategoi in 440/39 B.C. This would be comprehensible at once for the Akamantis, to which Perikles belongs, but I cannot find a certain explanation for the Pandionis being represented by two strategoi as well. The reason might perhaps be found in the grave crisis at the time of the  
<sup>30</sup> Samian revolt, which is sufficiently indicated by the fact that in 440/39 B.C. the government thought it necessary to suppress, so to speak, the liberty of the press <sup>20a</sup>). In such times Perikles may have used his influence with the people to set aside the law (or custom) of one general being elected from each tribe, in order to give him the help of men whom he  
<sup>35</sup> trusted implicitly, as he most probably did Hagnon and Phormion. We might say that the election of one strategos *ἐξ ἀπάντων Ἀθηναίων* was a sort of precedent. But I shall leave this question to others, who ought to deal with the whole question of the Athenian strategoi in the fifth and fourth centuries <sup>20b</sup>).

The problems (or the problem, for it may be one and the same) raised by this insufficient evidence refer on the one hand to the ἀτιμία of Phormion, *viz.* the time of his trial and the reason for it, on the other to the contradiction which seems to exist between A. and Thukydides in regard to the demand of the Acarnanians; for according to A. the Acarnanians asked for Phormion, according to Thukydides for a son or a relative of Phormion. As the scholion has lost the date given by A. for the trial and the reason for it; as Thukydides does not mention the trial of Phormion; as modern historians have inferred from the seeming contradiction that there have been two embassies <sup>21</sup>), we had better collect the evidence for the strategiai of Phormion in order to discover if there was anything in one of them which may have justified or provoked a state trial.

(1) Phormion was strategos in the second year of the Samian War 440/39 B.C. together with Hagnon according to Thukydides I, 117, 2.

(2) If the supplement of *IG*<sup>2</sup> I 50 is correct, he (not Hagnon) was re-elected for 439/8 B.C. We do not know whether, or where, he was engaged during the greater part of this year; he may have returned to Athens, or he may have taken part in the clearing up of the consequences of the Samian revolt and other disturbances in Asia Minor <sup>22</sup>). But perhaps we have to think in the first place of the West as being his sphere of action. It seems fairly certain that the treaties with Rhegion and Leontinoi, which were renewed in 433/2 B.C., had been concluded before the Samian War <sup>23</sup>), and Adcock may be right in describing the policy of Perikles in the West after the conclusion of the Thirty Years' Peace (446/5 B.C.) as a 'watchful and defensive quietism' <sup>24</sup>). Still we must at least consider the possibility that the 'first' alliance between Athens and Acarnania was concluded in 439/8 B.C.; that it was Phormion who concluded it; that his intimate relations with Acarnania, and the trust which the Acarnanians put in him, date from this year. Before (in 2, 69) narrating the sending out of Phormion with twenty ships to Naupaktos in the 'winter' of 430/29 B.C., Thukydides (2, 68) tells us about an unsuccessful attack of the Ambraciots, who were assisted by the Chaonians and other barbarian tribes, on the Amphilochean Argos, τοῦ θέρους (430 B.C.) τελευτῶντος. This campaign is preceded by a digression about the earlier relations between Ambrakia and Argos, beginning with the colonization of Argos and the whole region of Amphilocheia by Amphilochos, son of Amphiaraios, μετὰ τὰ Τρωικά <sup>25</sup>). 'Many generations later' the Amphilochean Argives ὑπὸ ξυμφορῶν πιεζόμενοι 'Αμπρακιώτας ὁμόρους ὄντας τῆι 'Αμφιλοχικῆι ξυνοίκους ἐπηγάγοντο, καὶ ἠλληλίσθησαν τὴν νῦν γλῶσσαν τότε

πρῶτον ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀμπρακιωτῶν ξυνοικησάντων· οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι Ἀμφίλοχοι βάρβα-  
 ροὶ εἰσιν. 'In the course of time' (χρόνῳ) the Amphiloichians of Argos were  
 driven out by their Ambraciot fellow-townsmen, and in consequence the  
 Amphiloichians διδάσιν ἑαυτοὺς Ἀκαρναῖσι, καὶ προσπαρκαλέσαντες ἀμ-  
 5 φότεροι Ἀθηναίους, οἱ αὐτοῖς Φορμίωνά τε στρατηγὸν ἐπεμψαν καὶ ναῦς  
 τριάκοντα, ἀφικομένου δὲ τοῦ Φορμίωνος αἰροῦσι κατὰ κράτος Ἄργος καὶ τοὺς  
 Ἀμπρακιώτας ἠνδραπόδισαν, κοινήι τε ὠκίσαν αὐτὸ Ἀμφίλοχοι καὶ Ἀκαρναῖες.  
 μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο ἡ ξυμμαχία πρῶτον ἐγένετο Ἀθηναίσι καὶ Ἀκαρναῖσιν. All  
 these events happened before the Ambraciots, trying to take their  
 10 revenge, ὕστερον ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ τήνδε τὴν στρατείαν ποιοῦνται i.e. before  
 spring 431 B.C. <sup>26</sup>). The stress laid on πρῶτον implies that later on there  
 was another alliance, a renewal of the first concluded by Phormion, and  
 from ὕστερον, or rather from the context in which the word stands, we  
 must infer that some time elapsed between the first and the second alian-  
 15 ce. Thukydidēs gives no dates and speaks vaguely (χρόνῳ, ὕστερον),  
 but he clearly distinguishes between the events before 'the War' and those  
 'in the War'. Unfortunately in his account of the *Pentekontaetia* he skips  
 the crucial years between the Samian revolt and the αἰτίαι καὶ διαφοραὶ <sup>27</sup>).  
 But I believe that with a certain degree of confidence we may put the  
 20 second ξυμμαχία in the period of the αἰτίαι καὶ διαφοραὶ, probably at about  
 the same time when Athens made her treaty with Korkyra and renewed  
 the treaties with the cities in Sicily, somewhat later than the first which  
 Phormion concluded in the year of his (at least for us) second strategia  
 in 439/8 B.C. <sup>28</sup>).

25 (3) There is no evidence for a strategia of Phormion in the years  
 between 438/7 and 433/2 B.C. But in 432/1 he was sent to Poteidaia with  
 sixteen hundred hoplites <sup>29</sup>).

(4) It is more than doubtful whether Phormion was re-elected for  
 431/0 B.C. (archon Euthydemos) at the ordinary election of strategoi in  
 30 the seventh prytany of the Attic year 432/1 B.C. (archon Pythodoros) <sup>30</sup>),  
 for the representative of the Pandionis for this year was surely Hagnon.  
 The words of Thukyde. 2, 58, 1—τοῦ δ' αὐτοῦ θέρους (430 B.C.) Ἄγων δ'  
 Νικίου καὶ Κλεόπομπος ὁ Κλεινίου, ξυστράτηγοι ὄντες Περικλέους, λαβόντες  
 τὴν στρατίαν ἥπερ ἐκεῖνος ἐχρήσατο, ἐστράτευσαν εὐθύς ἐπὶ Χαλκιδέας τοὺς ἐπὶ  
 35 Θράκης καὶ Ποτειδαίαν ἔτι πολιορκουμένην—leave no doubt in my opinion  
 that he is speaking about the colleagues of Perikles in his ἐπίπλους τῆι  
 Πελοποννήσῳ <sup>31</sup>) and of the troops he used for this expedition. There  
 was ample time in the first part of summer 430 B.C. for the departure  
 of the two strategoi for Thrace, and even for their return in the same Attic

year 431/0 B.C. <sup>32</sup>). It stands to reason that Phormion was not re-elected for 431/0 B.C. <sup>33</sup>), for to the best of my knowledge the Athenians never elected eleven strategoi at the same time <sup>34</sup>). Of course, there were by-elections of single strategoi in the course of the year for different reasons; 5 there were special commands, and there were prorogations <sup>35</sup>), so that at some given time there may have been eleven and even more generals in office (whether called στρατηγοί or something else), *i.e.* in actual command of Athenian ships and troops, simultaneously. Whether this was the case in 431/0 B.C. with Phormion, who had been general in 432/1 B.C., depends 10 on Thuk. 2, 29 and 2, 31. According to 2, 29 Phormion was still in Thrace in the 'summer' of 431 B.C.: Sitalkes had reconciled Athens with Perdikkas, and the king 'at once' campaigned against the Chalcidians 'with the Athenians and Phormion', who obviously was in command of his own corps, the sixteen hundred hoplites. It is usually inferred from 2, 31, 15 which narrates the invasion of the Megarid by the whole Athenian levy *περὶ τὸ φθινόπωρον τοῦ θέρους τούτου* (431 B.C.), that in the meantime the corps of Phormion had been recalled <sup>36</sup>). The inference *e silentio* seems to be rather weak, as Thukydidēs in this chapter works rather superficially with round numbers, and he therefore may well have forgotten the corps of Phormion; it is only in the 'summer' of 430 B.C., when 20 Hagnon and Kleopompos unsuccessfully tried to re-capture Poteidaia, that he tells us in what is evidently an afterthought that *Φορμίων δὲ καὶ οἱ ἑξακόσιοι καὶ χίλιοι οὐκέτι ἦσαν περὶ Χαλκιδίας* <sup>37</sup>). In any case, it is not only possible but probable that the events narrated in 2, 29 belong 25 either wholly or partly already to the Attic year 431/0 B.C. <sup>38</sup>). We then should have to assume that the Athenians (in consequence of the new situation in Thrace brought about by Sitalkes) prolonged the command of Phormion, and this would bear on our problem: if the Athenians did extend his term of office, or entrusted him with a special mission at the 30 court or in the headquarters of Perdikkas <sup>39</sup>) they cannot have been displeased with his generalship in Chalkidike; and as Phormion was again strategos in 430/29 B.C. we must further assume that they elected him again for this year at the regular elections in spring 430 B.C. Of course, it might be maintained on the ground of the rather fragmentary report 35 of Thukydidēs about the events in Macedonia and Thrace <sup>40</sup>) that the Athenians did not elect Phormion at the regular time, but later, on the demand of an Acarnanian embassy, or that they cancelled the election because in the εἴθνηα for the strategia of 432/1 B.C. (which may well have taken place when Phormion returned to Athens during the Attic

year 431/0 B.C.) Phormion was condemned to a fine and eventually became ἀτιμος in summer 430 B.C.; that this condemnation was again cancelled (in the manner reported by A.) because the Acarnanians asked for him, rightly fearing the revenge of the Ambraciots vanquished at the 5 end of summer 430 B.C. Such an assumption cannot be strictly refuted. But it would be pure guesswork and, as it seems to me, most improbable. For (a) Thukydides does not say anything either about a trial of Phormion after his return from Thrace or about a special demand of the Acarnanians for him (a demand for help may be safely assumed), though he does in 10 the case of Asopios <sup>40a</sup>). I think, as there is no allusion to special circumstances, we simply have to suppose that Phormion was selected from among the nine strategoi either because he was available at the moment or (more probably) because he had first-hand knowledge of the West and might be expected to be agreeable to the Acarnanians as the man who 15 in 439/8 B.C. had concluded the alliance between them and Athens. (b) As far as we know, Phormion had not been in the West since 439/8 B.C., he certainly was not in 432/1 <sup>40b</sup>). (c) The attack of the Ambraciots and their allies on Argos and Amphilochia happened at the end of summer 430 B.C., and Phormion started for the West in the 'winter' 20 of 430, probably in the beginning (our autumn), as the departure is the first event which Thukydides reports from this winter. There is hardly time to squeeze in what A. tells us about the annulling of the atimia. An embassy from Acarnania would almost coincide in time with the attack on Argos. I shall not stress another point: Phormion in 430/29 B.C. 25 did not operate in Acarnania proper, but guarded the naval station of Naupaktos and blockaded the Corinthian gulf; his activities in this theatre of war began in 429/8 B.C. with the arrival of the Peloponnesian fleet. The danger for Acarnania was evidently not yet urgent. In these circumstances we had better go on with our survey, not com- 30 mitting ourselves to 431/0 B.C. as the year of Phormion's disgrace. But to leave no point unconsidered, the fact that Phormion was not re-elected strategos for 431/0 B.C. does not in itself imply disgrace or condemnation: for a time (if not for his whole career) he seems to have run even with Hagnon in his constituency, the Pandionis; in the years 35 430/29 and 429/8 B.C. (when Phormion commanded in the West) though Hagnon was unsuccessful in the elections for the office of strategos, there is not a trace of disgrace, for, at least in 429/8 B.C., he held an important post in Thrace <sup>41</sup>).

(5) Now for the crucial years 430/29 and 429/8 B.C. and the full

report which Thukydides gives of the activities of Phormion in the West <sup>43</sup>). In 'winter' 430/29 B.C. (most probably in its beginning, autumn 430) the Athenians sent out two squadrons (Thuk. 2, 69, 1), six ships under Melesandros to Caria and Lycia and twenty ships under the 5 command of 'the strategos Phormion' *ὅς ὀρμώμενος ἐκ Ναυπάκτου φυλακὴν εἶχε μῆτ' ἐκπλεῖν ἐκ Κορίνθου καὶ τοῦ Κρισαίου κόλπου μηδένα μῆτ' ἐσπλεῖν*. As Thukydides tells us about the exploits of Melesandros and the fate which overtook him (2, 69, 2), but nothing about Phormion, we may take it that there was nothing to report: his task was the blockade 10 of the Corinthian gulf, and he acted according to instructions. To specify: Phormion did not participate in the defence of the Amphilo-chian Argos against the Ambraciots and their barbarian allies, for the attack was over before the 'winter' began (2, 68, 9) <sup>43</sup>); nor is there any reason for supposing that Phormion, when arriving with his squadron 15 at Naupaktos, concluded (or rather renewed) the treaty between Athens and Acarnania <sup>44</sup>). But he became very active in the 'summer' of 429 B.C., when *Ἀμπρακιῶται καὶ Χάονες βουλόμενοι Ἀχαρνανίαν τὴν πᾶσαν καταστρέψασθαι καὶ Ἀθηναίων ἀποστῆσαι πείθουσι Λακεδαιμονίους ναυ- 20 τικόν τε παρασκευάσασθαι ἐκ τῆς ξυμμαχίδος καὶ ὀπλίτας χιλίους πέμψαι ἐπ' Ἀχαρνανίαν* (2, 80, 1). The Spartans complied with the demand <sup>45</sup>); their admiral Knemos succeeded in landing the hoplites, *λαθόντες Φορ- μίωνα* (2, 80, 4), and began the campaign in Acarnania *οὐ περιμείνας τὸ ἀπὸ Κορίνθου ναυτικόν* (2, 80, 8). But when the barbarian allies of Knemos were beaten by the Acarnanians of Stratos he withdrew to Oiniadai 25 (always the anti-Athenian stronghold in that region) and here dismissed his army (2, 81-82). On the same day on which the barbarians were vanquished before Stratos Phormion intercepted a fleet of 47 ships sailing from Corinth and inflicted a defeat on them, capturing twelve ships without, as it seems, any loss to his own squadron of twenty 30 (2, 83-84). The Spartans, greatly annoyed by the issue of this battle, sent advisers (Brasidas among them) to Knemos, whom they charged with *μαλακία*, and they prepared for another naval battle (2, 85, 1-3). They had increased their fleet to 77 ships (2, 86, 2-4), while the reinforcements, for which Phormion had asked, did not arrive in time (2, 85, 5-6; 35 86, 2; 92, 7), because the twenty ships (the commander is not named, so that he is certainly not the successor of Phormion) were ordered to make first for Crete. Though they were held back there *ὕπ' ἀνέμων καὶ ἀπλοίας* the delay was entirely the fault of the home government, which (as so often was the case) knew better than the admiral on the spot <sup>46</sup>):



Phormion had asked in his dispatch for as many ships as possible and for speed (2, 85, 4); the government disregarded the second demand and rather grudgingly fulfilled the first. Consequently Phormion was obliged to give battle with only twenty ships against the overwhelming superiority of the Peloponnesian fleet, and in spite of his brilliant tactics he seems to have suffered rather severe losses (2, 90, 5-6) <sup>47</sup>. Though the battle resulted in the retreat of the enemy fleet (2, 94, 6), and though their purpose of breaking the blockade of the Corinthian gulf was certainly not attained, the Peloponnesians too claimed victory (2, 94, 5), and (what probably annoyed the Athenians particularly) their returning fleet, before demobilizing for the winter, could think of a surprise attack on the Peiraieus (2, 93-94). This happened ἀρχομένου τοῦ χειμῶνος 429 B.C. (2, 93, 1) <sup>48</sup>. After that—τοῦ αὐτοῦ χειμῶνος, ἐπειδὴ τὸ τῶν Πελοποννησίων ναυτικὸν διελύθη (2, 102, 1)—and, I think, not long after, Phormion followed up his naval victory by making a winter campaign in Acarnania with his rather weak forces (he had no more than eight hundred Athenian and Messenian hoplites). But owing to the season he was not able to attack Oiniadai (2, 102, 2). He therefore, still before the end of the winter, returned to Naupaktos and started for Athens ἅμα ἦρι ἀρχομένωι <sup>49</sup>, arriving safely with his ships and the booty of the campaign (2, 103) <sup>50</sup>. He consequently was at his post in the West from winter 430/29 until the end of the winter of 429/8 B.C., and I see no reason to doubt that he had been re-elected for the latter year though practically it is of no consequence if the Athenians prolonged his command <sup>51</sup>.

25 Here we must stop again in order to consider our problem, for the next thing Thukydides tells us—and this at the same time is the last mention of Phormion in our *historical* sources—is that in 'summer' of 428 B.C. the Athenians sent out a fleet of thirty ships under the command of Asopios, Phormion's son, who is expressly called strategos, κελευσάντων  
 30 Ἀκαρνανίων τῶν Φορμίωνός τινα σφίσι πέμψαι ἢ υἱὸν ἢ ξυγγενῆ ἄρχοντα (3, 7). The chapter narrates succinctly, but without omissions, the story of this unhappy expedition, which ended with the death of Asopios before Nerikos on Leukas; the report itself and the ὕστερον in § 3 show the historian to have anticipated a little chronologically. We are no longer  
 35 concerned with the accurate dates, but with the point that Thukydides mentions the embassy from Acarnania in a clause only in order to explain why the Athenians sent this particular strategos. He did not give a similar explanation on the occasion of the dispatch of Phormion in winter 430 B.C., and we inferred that Phormion himself was then sent not on the

request of the Acarnanians <sup>53</sup>). Even these few indications actually are more than we can expect. We may regret that Thukydides did not narrate the interesting history of the election, but it would be basically wrong to infer that such a pre-history did not exist. The fact is that there are no 'interesting details' in any part of Thukydides' work <sup>53</sup>), even the somewhat fuller account of the temporary disgrace of Perikles does not form an exception; in that case, too, it was the later writers who added the details which they learnt from the documents <sup>54</sup>). In view of the text of Thukydides it is to no purpose at all to speculate whether the Acarnanians knew, when their embassy started, that Phormion himself was no longer available, and why he was not; whether the embassy arrived in Athens before the regular elections of the strategoi for 428/7 B.C.; whether the appointment of Asopios was a by-election and so on <sup>55</sup>). We merely state some points which seem to be self-evident:

(1) whether the affair of Phormion falls in 430 or in spring 428 B.C., Thukydides certainly was fully informed about the events; (2) we must put complete confidence in his statements in 3, 7 as far as they go; (3) it is doubtful whether, in view of the succinct account which is solely concerned with historical facts, we may interpret the brief clause so exactly that a contradiction between Thukydides and A. arises; (4) if there is a contradiction, we are bound to believe the contemporary and admirer of the general. Personally I am convinced that there is no contradiction. I infer, in regard to Thukydides, from the addition *κελευσάντων Ἀχαρνάνων κτλ.* that the election of Asopios took place under special conditions, the details of which Thukydides suppressed. In regard to A., who added the details (as the Atthidographers did in the case of Perikles and in many others), it should be taken into account that we have his report in an incomplete and abbreviated form. It deals with just those events which Thukydides passes over, but it extends no further than to the legal fiction which eliminated the obstacle to a strategoi of Phormion (*and* for that matter of his son). It is perfectly possible in itself that Phormion was elected in a by-election or otherwise, and that another by-election became necessary (unless, as *e.g.* in the case of Kleon, a psephism of the sovereign people was sufficient) because in spring 428 B.C. he had died or was physically unable of undertaking the command <sup>56</sup>).

With the evidence at our disposal we cannot arrive at full certainty about these details. Instead of losing ourselves in fruitless speculations we had better put the question which must be answered in any case,

if only in order to understand the text of Thukydides. This text starts from the assumption that Phormion himself was not available for a new command in the West in 428 B.C., and the question is whether we may assume on the basis of the report of Thukydides that the trial of 5 Phormion was the direct consequence of his last strategia. Let us put an edge to this question: did Phormion simply return to Athens as Thukydides has it (2, 103), or was he *recalled* to Athens for an investigation of his conduct in waging the war in 429/8 B.C.? I am much inclined to support the second alternative. The return of the fleet at the *end* of the winter 10 is singular in itself: the home government must have known that the ships were indispensable on the spot not only for upholding the blockade but also for protecting Acarnania. One would imagine that the Acarnanians asked at once for the order to be cancelled and for a speedy return of the ships, and it is rather tempting (in the light of A.s story) to as- 15 sume that they had some knowledge of the storm brewing against their favorite Phormion, or of the steps already taken against him, and that they instructed their ambassadors accordingly. True, reading Thukydides we ourselves do not find anything with which to reproach Phormion. But on the other hand it seems obvious that the historian was writing 20 a plaidoyer for the man whose generalship he evidently admired, but who was a victim of the people's ignorance, or was perhaps sacrificed to the party-spirit, which raised its head again immediately after the death of Perikles, a state of things Thukydides clearly criticizes in his obituary on Perikles 57). The clear and consistent line of policy which Perikles 25 had followed in forcing the war and waging it began to waver: the conservative party was in favour of ending it as quickly as possible, the democrats turned from energy to ruthlessness. Hence the vacillations and vagaries of Athenian policy which became more and more apparent during the next years. The gravest point was the military insufficiency 30 of the democratic leaders, most of whom (to borrow a phrase used by Plutarch for Perikles' old enemy Thukydides Melesiu) were *ἤττον πολεμικοί, ἀγοραῖοι δὲ καὶ πολιτικοὶ μᾶλλον, οἰκουροῦντες ἐν ἄστει καὶ περὶ τὸ βῆμα συμπλεκόμενοι*; their ignorance of the technical side of military operations made them attempt too much and override again and again 35 the sober opinions of the experts. It was as early as 429 B.C., after the re-election of Perikles and during the few months of his last strategia, that the new order began to influence military affairs, and Thukydides is at pains to stress on the one hand the excellence of Phormion's naval strategy in both battles (for the second he gives his opinion of the military

situation in the speeches of the commanders on both sides), and on the other the grievous mistake of the home government in not acting up to the demands of their best general. The order given to the reinforcing squadron, *viz.* to intervene in a local feud in Crete before joining Phormion, is a first case in point: party-politics meddling with military affairs were (I submit) also the reason for re-calling the fleet from Nau-paktos. Then, if things went wrong, the generals were blamed <sup>59</sup>). Reading the detailed narrative of Thukydidēs we can easily imagine about what the people complained, or what was used as a pretext for

10 getting rid of an energetic commander, who (as far as we can see) had been like Hagnon a trusted helper of Perikles: the Spartan admiral had succeeded in landing troops in Acarnania λαθῶν Φορμίωνα; the second naval battle had not been a complete victory; the Peloponnesian fleet had been able to plan a surprise attack on the Peiraieus, and when this

15 plan miscarried, on Salamis, causing a panic in Athens <sup>60</sup>). The last straw may have been the reproach that Phormion had not attacked Oiniadai, which was the first object for Asopios in the next year <sup>60</sup>); the politicians probably did not appreciate the military reasons why Phormion did not embark on this venture. It was probably easy to per-

20 suade the people to recall the general. There may have been an εἰσαγγελία (or an ἀποχειροτονία), suspension from office, an εἴθυνα examining his conduct during his command which ended with his condemnation. On the whole it was not a very serious affair: there was no death penalty and no banishment, as in the case of Thukydidēs, the generals from

25 Sicily and others: perhaps the return of the fleet with the captured ships and other booty spoke too clear a language; a fine was imposed which again was not exorbitant; but as Phormion was (perhaps only for the moment) not able to pay, ἀτιμία followed. Then when shortly afterwards the Acarnanian ambassadors appeared, the people veered completely

30 round and re-elected, or rather re-instated, Phormion, and when he died or was disabled, elected in his stead his son Asopios. The affair was, or so it seems to me, a perfect example for the ταχybουλία and μεταbουλία of the Athenians <sup>61</sup>). The whole pre-history of the election (or appointment) of Asopios can easily be arranged in the time between the return

35 of Phormion εἴμα ἦρι 428 B.C. and the departure of Asopios in the 'summer' of the same year <sup>62</sup>), and I think we are justified in removing the seeming contradiction in our evidence in this simple manner. This solution seems to me to be preferable to the setting forth of artificial hypotheses, which are contradicted or made improbable even by our

incomplete tradition: the two Acarnanian embassies, the condemnation on account of the conduct of the war in Chalkidike, the assertion that A. transferred to Phormion what actually happened to Asopios. The tradition has never been examined fully or without prejudice; it has never been clearly stated that it is incomplete because Thukydidēs only gives briefly the reason for the election of Asopios, and because the Scholion on Aristophanes has preserved only the condemnation of Phormion and the annulling of it. But in fact the two historical witnesses supplement each other, even apart from the great probability that the Scholiast on Aristophanes found the story of Phormion under the year 429/8 or 428/7 B.C. <sup>63</sup>), and from the other point that the passages in Comedy seem to refer rather to 428 than to 431 B.C. <sup>64</sup>). A. certainly had a copy of Thukydidēs in his library, and he filled the gap of Thukydidēs' report (one of many gaps caused by the historian's ideas of what is historically important and what is not) from his acquaintance with Athenian scandals or with documentary and oral tradition. The case greatly resembles the tradition about the trial of Perikles.

(9) The fragment probably refers to the capture of the fortress by the Boeotians in summer 422 <sup>1</sup>), or to the regulation in the Peace of Nikias <sup>2</sup>) which played a particular part in the quarrels that immediately followed <sup>3</sup>). If A. gave the document of the peace he took it from Thukydidēs. Considering the little interest shown by the ancients in diplomatic accuracy it is not credible that he compared that text with the records, still less that he looked at the stele.

25 (10-11) The forms of government after the fall of Athens are well known and soundly attested, e.g. by the document of the *διάλυσις ἐπ' Εὐκλείδου ἀρχοντος* of 403/2 B.C., which excepts from the general amnesty τούς τριάκοντα καὶ τούς δέκα καὶ τούς ἑνδεκα καὶ τούς τοῦ Πειραιέως ἀρξάντας (Blass supplies, perhaps correctly: τούς <δέκα τούς> τοῦ Πειρ. 30 ἀρξ.) <sup>1</sup>): the Ten, one of whom is Rhinon of Paiania <sup>2</sup>), take over the government of the city after the fall of the Thirty and their withdrawal to Eleusis. The document is contradicted by the narrative of Aristotle <sup>3</sup>). He distinguishes two boards of Ten, the second replacing the first when οἱ τὸν Πειραιέα καὶ τὴν Μουνυχίαν ἔχοντες (the latter are οἱ ἀπὸ Φυλῆς, i.e. 35 Thrasybulos) were gaining the upper hand; it consisted of the βέλτιστοι εἶναι δοκοῦντες under the leadership of Rhinon of Paiania and the otherwise unknown Phayllos of Acherdus, ἐφ' ὧν συνέβη καὶ τὰς διαλύσεις γενέσθαι καὶ κατελεθεῖν τὸν δῆμον, συναγωνιζομένων καὶ προθυμουμένων τούτων. The purpose of this account is evident in the last words, and becomes even

more so subsequently <sup>4</sup>). To state it briefly, the source of Aristotle tries to transfer the merit of the reconciliation of the parties and the restoration of democracy from Thrasybulos and king Pausanias at least partly to the moderate 'oligarchs' who (if we may trust the statements as to the facts <sup>5</sup>) had joined the victorious democrats in good time. The conclusion that the second board of Ten is an invention of party-politics is certain in my opinion <sup>6</sup>). I shall not declare it to be positively impossible that Aristotle found the invention in A. <sup>7</sup>). If so, the latter took it from a contemporary pamphlet or from a speech, for Rhinon seems to have been a rather ambiguous person <sup>8</sup>). I do not think that A. himself misrepresented the facts: the fragments yield biased interpretations but no falsifications <sup>9</sup>). F 10-11 do not prove more than that A. gave an account of the election of the Ten and 'the following events' <sup>10</sup>), and that he gave the full lists of names, which Aristotle—and perhaps other Atthidographers—did not. Therefore the lexicographer consulted A. when looking for evidence for Molpis, a person unknown to us.

(12-15) Modern scholars are inclined to refer F 12 to Herodotos and F 15 to Hellanikos <sup>1</sup>); but, at least in F 15, the plural number contradicts this suggestion. Probably A. gave a survey of the actual strength of the Empire by enumerating the members, and he probably did this from the tribute lists, but he hardly gave the documents themselves as Krateros did <sup>2</sup>). For Ophryneion <sup>3</sup>) too this reference seems to be more probable than the narrative of Xerxes' march through the Troad <sup>4</sup>), which most likely occurred in the second book of A. <sup>5</sup>). Kapai seems to be attested in this passage alone.

(16) The Scholion is miserably abbreviated. There is hardly anything left about Thaulon and his action which is the aition for two widely different institutions, viz. the introduction of a most peculiar form of the killing of the ox at the ancient festival of the Dipolieia and the institution of the court of justice ἐν Πρυτανείῳ. We can reconstruct A.s account up to a point from (1) Hesych. s.v. βουτύπον· ἴκθυμὴν Ἀθήνησιν ἐκαλεῖτο, ἐκ τοῦ Θαυλωνιδῶν γένους καθιστάμενος. (2) Agallis Schol. Hom. *Il.* Σ 483 ἐκεῖσε (*scil.* ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ) γὰρ πρῶτος ἔθυσε βοῦν Θαύλων, φυγαδευθεὶς <δι' αὐτό> <sup>1</sup>). (3) Pausan. I, 24, 4 <sup>2</sup>) καὶ Διὸς ἔστιν ἄγαλμα τό τε Λεωχάρους (*scil.* ἐν τῇ Ἄκροπόλει) καὶ ὁ ὀνομαζόμενος Πολιεύς, ὧι τὰ καθεστηκότα ἐς τὴν θυσίαν γράφων τὴν ἐπ' αὐτοῖς λεγομένην αἰτίαν οὐ γράφω. τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Πολιέως κριθᾶς καταθέντες ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν μεμιγμένας πυροῖς οὐδεμίαν ἔχουσι φυλακὴν, ὁ βοῦς δέ, ὃν ἐς τὴν θυσίαν ἐτοιμάσαντες φυλάσσουσιν, ἀπτεται τῶν σπερμάτων φοιτῶν ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν. καλοῦσι δέ τινα τῶν ἱερέων

βουφόνον <δς κτείνας τὸν βοῦν> <sup>3)</sup> καὶ ταύτη τὸν πέλεκυν ῥίψας — οὕτω γὰρ ἔστιν οἱ νόμος — οἴχεται φεύγων· οἱ δὲ ἄτε τὸν ἄνδρα δς ἔδρασε τὸ ἔργον οὐκ εἰδότες ἐς δίκην ὑπάγουσι τὸν πέλεκυν. Pausan. I, 28, 10 τὸ δὲ ἐν πρυτανείῳ καλούμενον (*scil.* δικαστήριον), ἔνθα τῷ σιδήρῳ καὶ πᾶσιν ὁμοίως τοῖς ἀψύχοις δικάζουσιν, ἐπὶ τῷδε ἄρξασθαι νομίζω. Ἀθηναίων βασιλεύοντος Ἐρεχθέως, τότε πρῶτον βοῦν ἔκτεινεν ὁ βουφόνος ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ τοῦ Πολιέως Διός· καὶ ὁ μὲν ἀπολιπὼν ταύτη τὸν πέλεκυν ἀπῆλθεν ἐκ τῆς χώρας φεύγων, ὁ δὲ πέλεκυς παραυτίκα ἰάφειθ κριθείς† <sup>4)</sup>, καὶ ἐς τὸδε ἀνὰ πᾶν ἔτος κρίνεται. Pausanias omitted the name of the first βουφόνος, but the use of the axe and the tracing back of the action to one man allow us to infer with certainty that Pausanias used the version of A., not directly but taking it from a book Περὶ τῶν Ἀθήνησι δικαστηρίων. We may therefore claim for A. the date Ἀθηναίων βασιλεύοντος Ἐρεχθέως, and Wilamowitz' alteration of τετάρτης to πρώτης <sup>5)</sup> is at least attractive. Besides the version of A. there are two others which respectively give the names Diomos <sup>6)</sup> and Sopatros <sup>7)</sup> to the man who first killed an ox. An attempt at explaining the relations to each other of the several legends would lead us far too deep into the history of Attic religion. I hope to be able to deal with this problem in another place. In any case, we have here one of the few instances <sup>8)</sup> in which a fragment of A. becomes important for our knowledge of Attic cults.

(17) The singular number <sup>1)</sup> and the fourth book make it appear uncertain whether the Ἀργίν(ν)ουσ(σ)αι <sup>2)</sup> are meant which were made famous by the naval battle in 406/5 B.C. If they are, an alteration of  $\bar{\Delta}$  to  $\bar{\Gamma}$  would perhaps be more probable than the assumption of a second mention on another occasion. Or did A. dedicate to Sokrates, the philosopher of the conservative party <sup>3)</sup>, on the occasion of his execution (400/399 B.C.) an obituary in which he reviewed the chief dates of his life? The fragments do not anywhere else show an interest in philosophers or philosophy <sup>4)</sup>.

(18) Hell. Oxyrh. II 1 (395 B.C.) ἀπέπεμπον (the Athenians) μὲν γὰρ δεπλα τε καὶ ὑπηρεσίας ἐπὶ τὰς ναῦς τὰς μετὰ τοῦ Κ[όνωνος, ἐπέμ]φθησαν δὲ πρέσβεις ὡς βασιλέα π[ρόσθεν] <sup>1)</sup> οἱ περὶ . π . κράτη τε καὶ Ἀγνίαν καὶ Τελεσῆγορον, οὓς καὶ συλλαβῶν Φάραξ ὁ πρότερον ναύαρχος ἀπέστειλε πρὸς τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους, οἱ ἀπέκτειναν αὐτούς. Isaias II, 8 Ἀγνίας γοῦν ὅτε ἐκπλεῖν παρεσκευάζετο πρεσβεύσων ἐπὶ ταύτας τὰς πράξεις, αἱ τῇ πόλει συμφερόντως εἶχον. The embassy belongs to the more or less remote antecedents of the Corinthian war and to the game of intrigues which accompanied the Spartan actions in Asia Minor <sup>2)</sup>. It was sent some time before the events

of 395 B.C. and the affair of Dorieus mentioned in F 46, and it is usually dated before autumn 397 B.C. But the nauarchy of Pharax in 398/7 B.C. yields an approximate date only, for he seems to have held the command far into 396 B.C.<sup>3</sup>). The difficulty of the occurrence of the embassy in the fifth book<sup>4</sup>) is not removed by the supposition that A. 'mentioned it belatedly'<sup>5</sup>). It would perhaps not be impossible to find an occasion for a belated mention in the probable chronological limits of the fifth book<sup>6</sup>); but the brief excerpt of Harpokration definitely gives the impression that it comes from the account of the events themselves, and 10 these the Atthidographer, who wrote *προβεις τὸν ἄρχοντα*<sup>7</sup>), can only have supplied *suo anno*.

(19) Schol. Laur. Aischin. 3, 51 ἐπ' ἀρχοντος Καλλιμήδους (360/59 B.C.) . . . Ἀθηναῖοι δύναμιν εἰς Ἑλλάσποντον ἐξέπεμψαν καὶ στρατηγὸν ἐπ' αὐτῆι Κηφισόδοτον, δὲ ναυμαχίας Λαμψακηνοῦς εἰσηγγέλθη ὡς προδεδοκῶς . . . καὶ 15 διὰ κακίαν ἠττηθεὶς τὴν ναυμαχίαν . . . τῆς μὲν θανατικῆς ζημίας ἀπελύθη, ἐζημιώθη δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου τάλαντοις πέντε. Aischin. 3, 51 (in the ἐξετασμός of the life of Demosthenes) ἢ τὰ περὶ τὴν Κηφισοδότου στρατηγίαν καὶ τὸν τῶν νεῶν ἔκπλουον τὸν εἰς Ἑλλάσποντον, ὅτε εἰς ὧν τῶν τριηράρχων Δημοσθένης, καὶ περιάγων τὸν στρατηγὸν ἐπὶ τῆς νεῶς, καὶ συσσιτῶν καὶ συνθῶν καὶ συσπέν- 20 δων, καὶ τούτων ἀξιοθεὶς διὰ τὸ πατρικὸς αὐτῶι φίλος εἶναι, οὐκ ὤκνησεν ἀπ' εἰσαγγελίας αὐτοῦ κρινομένου περὶ θανάτου κατήγορος γενέσθαι. Demosth. 23, 166 . . . ἐπ' Ἀλωπεκόννησον, ἢ Χερρονήσου μὲν ἔστι καὶ ἦν ὑμετέρα, λησιτῶν δὲ ἦν μεστὴ καὶ καταποντιστῶν — (167) ἐνταῦθα δ' ἐλθόντων ἡμῶν καὶ πολιορκούντων τούτους, . . . ἡμῖν μὲν προσέβαλλεν (*scil.* ὁ Χαριδῆμος), ἐβοήθει δὲ τοῖς 25 ληισταῖς καὶ καταποντισταῖς. καὶ πρότερον προσκαθήμενος τὸν ὑμέτερον στρατηγὸν ἐπεισε καὶ ἠνάγκασε μὴ τὰ βέλτισθ' ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν πράττειν . . . , καὶ γράφει δὴ τὰς συνθήκας ταύτας τὰς πρὸς Κηφισόδοτον, ἐφ' αἷς ὑμεῖς οὕτως ἡγανακτήσατε . . . ὥστ' ἀπεχειροτονήσατε μὲν τὸν στρατηγὸν, πέντε τάλαντοις δ' ἐζημιώσατε, τρεῖς δὲ μόναι ψῆφοι διήνεγκαν τὸ μὴ θανάτου τιμῆσαι. For the dates 30 of Kephisodotos see *P. A.* 8313; *Mittelhaus RE XI* col. 230 no. 2; about the form of the proceedings against him see Lipsius *A. R.* I p. 296 n. 38; Swoboda *Herm.* 28, 1893, p. 563 n. 5. A. certainly gave a fuller account of the campaign with more details; in the context of Demosthenes the campaign is merely one of the proofs for the permanently hostile 35 attitude of Charidemos towards Athens. This is one of the many cases in which the loss of the *Atthis* is regrettable, because from it we should know whether Demosthenes belonged to the accusers of Kephisodotos as Aischines maintains<sup>1</sup>).

(20) A. is evidently cited for the form *Μαλαέτης*. If it occurs in its



proper place one might think in the fifth book of the history of Iason of Pherai: in 371 B.C. one of the Malian votes was given to the Oetaeans with Herakleia Trachinia <sup>1)</sup>. A. must have dealt repeatedly with matters concerning membership of the Amphictiony <sup>2)</sup> and the changes in it.

5 But the form of the ethnikon raises doubts: the gulf at least is always called Μηλιεύς by poets and prose writers down to the second century B.C. <sup>3)</sup>. Meineke suggested a removal of the words, to which the citation belongs, into the article about the Laconian promontory. The suggestion is attractive, and if it is correct the fragment might refer to Timotheos' <sup>10</sup> enterprises in the Ionic Sea in 375-373 B.C. Perhaps Isokrates' praise of Timotheos <sup>4)</sup>, which obviously paraphrases the clauses of the Peace of Kallias, furnishes the connexion: he characterizes the result of the victories of the general by stating that Λακεδαιμονίων δὲ μετ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν χρόνον μηδ' ὕφ' ἐνὸς ἐωρᾶσθαι μήτε ναυτικὸν ἐντὸς Μαλέας περιπλέον μήτε πεζὸν <sup>15</sup> στρατόπεδον δι' Ἴσθμοῦ πορευόμενον, ὅπερ αὐτοῖς τῆς περὶ Λεῦκτρα συμφορᾶς εὐροὶ τις ἂν αἴτιον γεγενημένον.

(21) Plin. *N. H.* 4, 57 in *Megarico sinu Methurides* <sup>1)</sup> *IIII*. Accordingly Τροϊζῆνος is as impossible as the (Argive) Ἀκτὴ (suggested by Meineke) instead of Ἀττική.

<sup>20</sup> (22) The fragment is generally, and I think correctly, referred to the command of A. himself in Amorgos <sup>1)</sup> and dated accordingly. It is wrong to bring the doubtful Μελανία into the quotation <sup>2)</sup>, and Meineke's alteration Ἀμοργίων is at least unnecessary.

(23) It was at Neon that Philomelos fell <sup>1)</sup>, who had, among others, <sup>25</sup> Athenian auxiliaries <sup>2)</sup>. The earlier form Νεών is still used by Demetrios of Skepsis <sup>3)</sup>, the later by Pausanias <sup>10</sup>, 2, 4; 3, 2, who, however, in <sup>10</sup>, 32, 9 wrote Νεῶνα following Herodotos.

(24) The bold *coup de main* by which one of the sacred triereis fell into the hands of Philip must be assigned to the time before 353/2 B.C. <sup>30</sup> because of F 29; it probably occurred in the Attic year 354/3 B.C. The passage in Demosthenes' *First Philippic*—apart from the difficult question about the date of this speech <sup>1)</sup>—merely furnishes a *terminus ante quem*; incidentally it is not certain whether τὰ τελευταῖα <sup>2)</sup> refers to the time, or places at the end of the enumeration the crowning instance <sup>35</sup> of Philip's privateering. The sequence Lemnos, Imbros, Geraistos, Marathon is geographical and is to show that the Athenians were not even able to protect the coasts of their own country: τὰ τελευταῖ' εἰς Μαραθῶνα ἀπέβη, καὶ τὴν ἱερὰν ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας ὤχιετ' ἔχων τριήρη, ὑμεῖς δ' οὔτε ταῦτα δύνασθε κωλύειν οὔτ' εἰς τοὺς χρόνους, οὓς ἂν προηῆσθε, βοηθεῖν.

(25-28) The reference of the four fragments is uncertain. If in F 27 Kalydna-Kalymna in the Carpathian Sea <sup>1)</sup> is meant, F 27-28 may be connected with each other and may belong to the context of F 22 and the history of the Social War (357/6-355/4 B.C.); if it is the island (or according to Strabo 13, 1, 46 the group of islands) situated north of Tenedos on the route to the Hellespont, F 25-27 may belong together and to the context of F 24. The capture of Sestos by Chares, Kersobleptes' cession of the Chersonnese to Athens, and the despatch of kleruchoi to that place in 353/2 B.C. <sup>2)</sup> cannot have occurred until the seventh book. In the tribute lists of the fifth century the inhabitants of the Ionian <sup>3)</sup>, Hellespontine, and 'Macedonian' <sup>4)</sup> Hairai (F 25) are called Αἰραῖοι or Αἰραῖης <sup>5)</sup>, never Αἰράται; but F 20 is a weak foundation for assuming that A. had a preference for formations in -άτης. Gresinos (F 26) does not seem to occur elsewhere. In F 27 A. is quoted not for the epithet of the god <sup>6)</sup> but for one of the forms of the ethnicon, probably for Καλόδνιος, which alone occurs in the tribute lists. We cannot decide which of the homonymous islands is meant, but we have no reason for assuming a confusion with Κάλυνδα· πόλις Καρίας <sup>7)</sup>. On Telos (F 28) see L. Robert *Rev. d. Phil.* 8, 1934, p. 43 ff.; *B. C. H.* 57, 1933, p. 542 n. 2.

<sup>20</sup> (29) Meineke's correction Μετάχοιον οἰκῶν seems certain in view of περιφραστικῶς and the analogies s.v. 'Ακόναι and 'Ερύθεια. If so, the reference to the heroic combat of the Coroneans against Onomarchos in 353/2 B.C. <sup>1)</sup> becomes doubtful: it is not the Metachoiotai but στρατιῶται ἐκ τοῦ Μεταχόιου who came to the assistance of the Coroneans. <sup>25</sup> But it is possible that in a full account volunteer helpers were mentioned besides the soldiers <sup>3)</sup>.

(30) The construction of Didymos' note shows (1) that the grammarian did not find the linguistic and the antiquarian evidence about ὀργάς (col. 14, 3-35) either in the *Atthis* of Philochoros or in that of A., a point <sup>30</sup> which should be noted generally, and particularly in investigations of the sources of Scholia and of Plutarch; (2) that for the explanation of the passage in Demosthenes he did not himself look up A. but took the quotation from his own (or other) collections about the term ὀργάς <sup>1)</sup>. The consequence is that the quotation from A., although giving once more <sup>35</sup> the facts referring specially to the ὀργάς, lacks the historical setting in the campaign of the Athenians μετ' Ἐπιάλτου τοῦ στρατηγούντος. Didymos regarded the *Atthis* of Philochoros as sufficient for the historical events here as in other cases <sup>2)</sup>; he found in it the whole material for the time of Demosthenes. That explains at the same time why we have so few

fragments of A. from a time which he had treated as a contemporary and from his own knowledge. These facts were not realized by B. Keil <sup>2)</sup> who supplied διὰ τοῖν θεοῖν <ἐπιτρέψαντας αὐτοῖς ὀρίσασθαι> ὅπως βούλωντο, and consequently found in A. 'who wrote in Megara' <sup>4)</sup> the Megarian version—a suggestion *a priori* incredible for an Atthidographer <sup>5)</sup>. There is no difference as to the matter between A. and Philochoros; on the slight alterations, which the latter made in the text of his predecessor see on 328 F 155. About the importance of this fragment for the identification of the politician A. with the Atthidographer and for estimating the style of the *Atthis* see Text p. 86, 20 ff. In regard to the style it is worth noticing that one might have doubts as to the subject of ἐνέμειναν; but it certainly is not 'the Athenians and Megarians' (as Diels thought) but either the former or the latter. If we refer ἐνέμειναν to the Megarians we must assume a considerable brevity of expression which A. may have admitted in order to avoid a new verb and indirect speech. A reference to the Athenians is perhaps more natural in an *Atthis*, and at the same time more likely in regard to both syntax and matter. Ἀθηναῖοι at the opening is the subject of the whole sentence, the delimiting is the business of the Athenians, and it does not take place only towards Megarian territory, but the στήλαι are put up κύκλωι. Philochoros must have thus interpreted the sentence, and I have punctuated accordingly.

(31) Overlooked by Fredrich *IG XII 8 p. 76; 79; 81* and *RE IV A col. 390*. The number of the book shows that the fragment does not belong to the conflict between Thasos and Maroneia in 361/0 (?) about which Philochoros reported (328 F 43). The conflict may have broken out again later, and both Thasos and Maroneia must have been mentioned repeatedly during the following years <sup>1)</sup>. The exact reference cannot be guessed.

(32) Akontion is not known. It is extremely unfortunate that we cannot date this only fragment from the last book, but there are too many occasions for mentioning Euboia in the decade 350-340 B.C. It would be pure guesswork to suggest the union formed by the Euboean cities in 341/0 B.C. and their joining the coalition against Philip. The regrettable fact remains that we cannot establish the concluding point of the *Atthis* <sup>1)</sup>.

(33) The number of the book is not credible <sup>1)</sup>. If, following B. Keil <sup>2)</sup>, we refer the fragment to the Peace of Philokrates and the cession of Amphipolis to Philip in 346/5 B.C. (an event which almost certainly was still entered by A. in his *Atthis*), the alteration ἐν <τῇ> ἡ would be

slight. But A. is quoted for the former name 'Εννέα ὄδοι, which may have occurred as early as the second book. The alteration of Schwartz ἐν [.]β̄ is even slighter, and not quite certain only because the Epitome of Harpokration does not give the article before the number <sup>3</sup>). Thukydides, 5 in a digression worked into his text <sup>4</sup>), knows the pre-history of the place 'which was formerly called 'Εννέα ὄδοι' <sup>5</sup>), and he gives dates beginning with the unsuccessful attempt at a foundation made by Aristagoras 32 years before the defeat at Drabeskos in 465/4 B.C., i.e. (as Thukydides counts the archons inclusively in this chapter as elsewhere) in 496/5 10 B.C. <sup>6</sup>). After further 29 years Hagnon succeeds in founding the place (437/6 B.C.) <sup>7</sup>). It is more likely that Thukydides in his fourth book took the dates from Hellanikos' 'Ἱερείαι, published after 423 B.C., than from that writer's *Atthis*, published after 404/3 B.C. But we may assume that Hellanikos repeated the date, which was important for Athens too, like 15 many other facts in his *Atthis*, where he put it under an archon. It is comprehensible that this particular item should have been passed on in the later *Atthides*. Otherwise we can only refer the fragment to the foundation of Hagnon. But the alteration of ἸΒ to Γ̄ is slight only if the source of Harpokration had Attic characters for the numbers, and 20 this is not very likely.

(34) Plutarch gives A.s conception of the seisachtheia <sup>1</sup>) as a variant of an account which goes back through an intermediate source to Aristotle <sup>2</sup>). His idea is entirely sensible <sup>3</sup>), the difference between the two conceptions being perfectly clear: for Aristotle (who probably represents 25 the general opinion in Athens) the seisachtheia is a complete cancelling of debts, as the meaning of the word seems to require <sup>4</sup>); it was for him an isolated measure which he emphatically placed before the legislation <sup>5</sup>). For A. the ἀποσεισθεῖν τὸ βάρος consists in an inflationary reform of the currency <sup>6</sup>), by which the owed capital (and consequently 30 the owed interest) were reduced by about a third <sup>7</sup>). The essential difference is that in A. the seisachtheia up to a point loses its independence and becomes a mere consequence of the reform of coinage and weights, a consequence, it is true, which Solon had intended, because he wished to relieve the condition of the poor <sup>8</sup>). The question may remain open 35 whether A. attached any importance to an explanation of the reform of currency for its own sake by showing the purpose of it (neither Aristotle nor others did this) <sup>9</sup>); the main point is that his conception of the famous act of deliverance wrought by the great liberator is of course neither a 'misunderstanding' <sup>10</sup>) nor a 'naiveté' <sup>11</sup>), but a well considered

departure from the general opinion <sup>12</sup>); that his conception has a purpose, and that the purpose is obvious: the creator of the Athenian democracy (which A. definitely approves in the form given to it by Solon and Kleisthenes <sup>13</sup>) is to appear as friendly to the people, but not as a radical.

5 This interpretation absolves Solon from the revolutionary measure of a confiscation of property, a menacing idea which alarmed the bourgeoisie of the fourth century <sup>14</sup>). The precedent occurring in their own history had to be eliminated. The relation between A. and Aristotle (in the appendix or digression which 'Aθπ. 10 is <sup>15</sup>) is the same as in the question

10 of ostracism <sup>16</sup>). In this instance too Aristotle silently corrected his main Attidographic source <sup>17</sup>), returning to the general opinion contested by A.; he judged more objectively because he stood outside the party struggles. Apparently Philochoros did the same <sup>18</sup>), and this permits of an inference as to Hellanikos and Kleidemos, for (as far as we can judge)

15 Philochoros did not use the 'Aθπ. <sup>19</sup>) which did not furnish enough details for his purpose, nor anything that he could not find more accurately or more fully in the earlier *Atthides*. But the modern historian has an easier task in the case of the seisachtheia than in the question as to the time of the law about ostracism. Of course, we must admit that Aristotle had

20 no documentary tradition about the various measures of Solon, apart from the legislation proper: we do not know on what grounds he asserts so confidently that the seisachtheia preceded, or particularly that the reform of the currency followed, the legislation <sup>20</sup>). Further it is at least conceivable that the seisachtheia as an isolated measure taken once only

25 continued to live in the memory of the people; that this memory wishfully exaggerated the relief bestowed on the debtors; and that the Attidographers simply and without an examination accepted the popular interpretation until A., in the light of his political conviction, re-considered the activity of Solon and arranged the various acts differently. For

30 the obvious bias of A. does not in itself contradict the possibility that the conservative critic of the popular opinion was correct. But too much tells against his being so <sup>21</sup>): (1) the name *σεισάχθεια*, which can really mean only the shaking off of the burden, not a mere alleviation <sup>22</sup>); (2) the poems of Solon which speak of the liberation of the land without

35 any qualification, and which are therefore used by Aristotle for basing on them his conception of the seisachtheia <sup>23</sup>); (3) and I think decisively, the consideration that if the poems describe the condition correctly at least up to a point (and there is hardly a doubt that they do) the peasants, being deeply involved in debts, evidently could as little have paid two

Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.)

thirds of their debts as the whole sum. A payment of the interest in the lighter money would have helped them even less: quite apart from the fact that this would have been illusory for the home market because they also would have received the lighter money for their products, the creditors could recover their losses by increasing the rate of interest (more easily than the peasants could by increasing their prices), for the legislation of Solon does not seem to have limited the rate of interest <sup>24</sup>). So far as we can judge conditions in Athens in the sixth century a thorough reform must have taken place in the interest of the peasants, from whom came by far the larger part (if not the whole) of the hoplite army. There was no need for Kleisthenes to help economically the class of free peasants, whom Peisistratos also had favoured. To put it briefly: A.s explanation is ingenious, but possible only because of the profound failure to understand, or rather the lack of, an economic theory, a lack which surprises us less in Xenophon than in Aristotle. Whatever was the purpose of the currency reform, and whether or no A. was a 'shrewd financier' <sup>25</sup>), we must not bring in the modern idea of devaluation. This idea (which was unconsciously at the bottom of some commercial measures) was in itself alien to antiquity, and was not even discussed in the financial difficulties of the fourth century. The primitive remedies were usually gold money, bad money, and higher taxes.

(35) The scholion is in a muddle now; but Aristotle 'Αθπ. 15, 1 νικήσας δὲ τὴν ἐπὶ Παλληνίδι μάχην καὶ λαβὼν τὴν πόλιν (*scil.* Πεισιστράτος) favours the reference of τούτου τοῦ πόλεμος, not to δῆμος <sup>1</sup>). As both testimonies give nothing but the bare facts, and as the battle at the Παλληνίδος 'Αθηναίης ἱερὸν, of which Herodotos <sup>2</sup>) gives a full account, cannot have been lacking in any *Atthis*, we must not count F 35 among the 'agreements' between A. and Aristotle <sup>3</sup>), which are to prove that the former was the main Atthidographic source of the latter. But as this fact is established otherwise <sup>4</sup>) we may perhaps trace back to the *Atthis* of A. the surplus found in Aristotle as compared with Herodotos, *viz.* the foundation of Rhaikelos, the details about the sojourn of Peisistratos at the Thermaean gulf and in Thrace, and the disarmament of the people<sup>5</sup>). That is, we may assume, a relation between the sources similar to that which seems to exist in 'Αθπ. 20-21. About the history and the chronology of the Peisistratids in the *Atthis* see *Atthis* p. 152 ff.; 188 ff.

(36) The scholiast or rather his source (Didymos?) gives a definition, succinct but still applying in the fifth century, of the kolakretai as the actual treasurers of the Athenian State <sup>1</sup>); subsequently he tries to de-

termine their various functions. He cites for his information Aristophanes of Byzantium—surely the Λέξεις or Γλῶσσαι which probably included a special chapter entitled Πολιτικά ὀνόματα <sup>2)</sup>—and A., and it is usually assumed that he corrects from the latter the statement of the grammarian, which is not wrong, but too narrow. Although Didymos was in a position to look up the *Atthis* of A. and occasionally did so, and though Hesychios s.v. κωλακρέται· ἀργυρικοί ταμίαι, οὓς τινες οἴονται μόνου τοῦ δικαστικοῦ προλοτασθαι seems to recommend this supposition on Didymos' sources, it seems surprising that Aristophanes, well-read as he was, should have known neither Aristotle nor A. I therefore prefer to refer *ὡς φησιν* not to the grammarian, but to the poet Aristophanes, who repeatedly mentioned the kolakretai in their relation to the heliastai <sup>3)</sup>, i.e. I consider the whole scholion to be an excerpt (of Didymos?) from Aristophanes' Λέξεις which he naturally looked up in the first place for the explanation of an Athenian πολιτικὸν ὄνομα. The grammarian correctly quoted first the poetical witness, and then the Atthidographer, as he did e.g. in F 34 and in Philochoros 328 F 168. Further, although the κωλακρέται were the ταμίαι τῶν πολιτικῶν χρημάτων down to the last decades of the fifth century <sup>4)</sup>, being mentioned therefore in numerous and various passages, comparison with Aristotle 'Αθπ. 8, 3 <sup>5)</sup> makes it appear probable that F 36 comes from the description of the constitution of Solon. Wilamowitz <sup>6)</sup> corrected the slight corruption ναυκληρικῶν from Aristotle, and he emphasized the fact that in both passages directions of the laws are quoted <sup>7)</sup>. His inference that Aristotle used the Atthidographer(s) is possible, although I am confident that Aristotle read the Solonian laws himself. In any case, the words quoted from the laws are not 'identical': Aristotle proves the existence and the functions of the naukraroi (which he too found rather enigmatic) in the pre-Solonian state by a formula which 'often' occurred in the old Solonian laws <sup>8)</sup>; A. quotes verbatim one law. It is entirely credible that the law in the form quoted by A. occurred in 'Solon's calendar of sacrifices' <sup>9)</sup>, but then it is obvious too that he quoted it not on account of the kolakretai but on account of the θεωρία to Delphi, for, like the other Atthidographers, A. did not enter in his *Atthis* the whole code. The difference between him and Aristotle in the use made of the law thus becomes even more evident: we must therefore be on our guard not to use the occurrence of the kolakretai in both writers as a proof that the foundation of 'Αθπ. 5-13 was wholly taken from A.; the question of the sources is much more complicated for these chapters. I suggest that A. adduced some facts

which would show us how Solon brought Athens into the sphere of Delphi <sup>10</sup>). It is extremely regrettable that no more is left of this account; further information about the kolakretai <sup>11</sup>) is poor and cannot be used to supplement F 36.

- 5 (37) The ultimate source of the scholion, which exists in several versions and is partly mutilated <sup>1</sup>), are books on *Κωμωιδούμενοι* <sup>2</sup>) which tried to determine the identity of the Thukydidēs who occurs in *Ach.* 702 ff. and in *Vesp.* 946 ff. They grouped together for this purpose the known bearers of the name; neither in the scholion nor in the *Vita*  
 10 *Thucydidis* by Marcellinus do the lists come from A., who entered the poet Thukydidēs *suo anno* <sup>3</sup>). It is from the *Κωμωιδούμενοι* too that come the citations of A. and Philochoros, who of course here and elsewhere <sup>4</sup>) are in the right against Theopompos, who was casual and not very well acquainted with the conditions in fifth century Athens. Even  
 15 if A. knew the tenth book of Theopompos, or at least his pamphlet about the Athenian demagogues (it is chronologically possible that he did <sup>5</sup>)), neither the wording nor the state of the scholion allows of the inference that A. criticised Theopompos. Such a supposition is improbable in itself, and polemics in which the name of the criticized author  
 20 is given are quite incredible: it is almost without exception the grammarians who add the names later to the usually anonymous citations <sup>6</sup>). In regard to Aristophanes I do not doubt that he meant the opponent of Perikles, as the source of the scholiast supposes. We can infer with some certainty A.s opinion of him from Aristotle's 'Αθπ. 28, 3 <sup>7</sup>), but it  
 25 is an inference, not a proof for the dependence on A. of Aristotle <sup>8</sup>): the facts mentioned in ch. 28 come from *Atthides* or at least occurred in them too, but the grouping and the judgment of the facts belong to Aristotle as the book about the demagogues belongs to Theopompos. A detail: Aristotle calls Thukydidēs not the son of Melesias, but *κηδεστής*  
 30 *Κίμωνος*, and he does not do this in order to prevent confusion but because he wants to point out the social position of the earlier *προστάται* του δήμου.

- (38) The *Atthis* dates the Samian War in the years of Timokles 441/0 and Morychides 440/39 B.C. <sup>1</sup>); the list of strategoi who swear the peace-  
 35 treaty belongs to 439/8 B.C. <sup>2</sup>). As Thukydidēs I, 117, 2 mentions for the reinforcements in the second year of the war five other names in which we can only see the strategoi of 440/39 B.C. <sup>3</sup>) the list of A. must refer to 441/0 B.C. As Thukydidēs <sup>4</sup>) says about the first battle only that it was fought *Περιπλέους δεκάτου αὐτοῦ στρατηγούντος*, A. supplement-



ed him by giving the full list with the official sequence of the phylai and with the official form of the names <sup>5</sup>). The only difficulty is that the scholion, the text of which was for the first time correctly edited from the Marcianus gr. 423 by F. Lenz <sup>6</sup>), includes eleven names instead of 5 ten, among them two representatives from the Akamantis, viz. Περικλῆς Χολαργεὺς and Γλαύκων ἐκ Κεραμείων. This is the foundation of Lenz' attack on the prevailing opinion which is that one of the ten strategoi had a higher position, was, in fact, the commander in chief, and that this 'supreme strategos' was elected ἐξ ἀπάντων Ἀθηναίων, in consequence 10 whereof one of the ten tribes remained without a representative <sup>7</sup>). Lenz maintains that this opinion 'is to be modified inasmuch as the number (*scil.* of strategoi) did not always have to be nine besides the commander in chief, but 'sometimes was ten'. But his explanation of the alleged fact that there were eleven strategoi in 441/o B.C. (as well as in 15 433/2 B.C.), and that 'Perikles had Glaukon elected as his proxy because in the interest of the state he did not wish to be absent from Athens too often or too long at a time' is open to the gravest doubts. His main prop is the much contested passage in Thukyd. I, 57, 6 about the expedition against Perdikkas in 433/2 B.C.: ἔτυχον γὰρ τριάκοντα ναῦς ἀποστέλλ- 20 λοντες καὶ χιλίους ὀπλίτας ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν αὐτοῦ, Ἀρχεστράτου τοῦ Λυκομήδους μετ' ἄλλων δέκα στρατηγούντος. On the strength of this passage Lenz speaks of 'the agreement between Thukydidēs and A.', which (in his opinion) 'eliminates definitely the hypothesis that in the text of Thukydidēs two numbers were confused'. I shall not discuss here the historical views of 25 Lenz concerning the situations in 441/o and in 433/2 B.C. (in my opinion the two situations differ widely), nor shall I put some factual questions (which might be rather inconvenient for Lenz <sup>8</sup>), and I shall not even argue the question of the text which has long ago been answered to my satisfaction and I hope to that of other scholars too <sup>9</sup>). It is sufficient 30 for my purpose to state simply that the passage of Thukydidēs is certainly not 'the best possible parallel to our text, and enables us the better to understand Androtion's list, which apparently reproduces the original document of the Athenian archives very carefully' <sup>10</sup>). The difference between the two passages is obvious: while for 441/o B.C. we have the 35 names of all strategoi and know the tribes of all, we have eight names only for 433/2 B.C., and of five tribes only do we know the representatives <sup>11</sup>). This is a very weak foundation for Lenz' hypothesis <sup>12</sup>), and as in the list of the Scholiast the name of one deme is certainly corrupt, there remains the alternative proposed by H. T. Wade-Gery that Λαμπίδης Πειραιεύς <sup>13</sup>)

does not give us the name of an eleventh strategos but 'alternative suggestions for the corrupt word 'Αθηναῖος' <sup>14</sup>). As matters are, *i.e.* till we get an adequate discussion of the many problems of the Athenian strategía, I am definitely inclined to prefer this alternative.

5 (39) The discussion which tries to explain the enormous strength of the invasion army <sup>1</sup>), or finds it illuminating for the patriotism of A. <sup>2</sup>), goes astray because it regards δέκα μυριάσι as being the tradition. But A. is not Phanodemos <sup>3</sup>), and what we read in the Mss. is a corrupt καὶ μυριάσι which we are free to correct. Neither Thukydides <sup>4</sup>) nor Ephoros <sup>5</sup>) has given figures; not until Plutarch <sup>6</sup>) do we find πρὸς τοὺς ἑξακισμυρίους  
10 Πελοποννησίων καὶ Βοιωτῶν δπλαίτας· τοσοῦτοι γὰρ ἦσαν οἱ τὸ πρῶτον ἐμβαλόντες. This figure may ultimately come from an *Atthis*, and our fragment is thus at any rate dated to the first invasion in May 431 B.C. <sup>7</sup>). The question may remain open whether this number ought to be inserted into  
15 the text of A., but the likeness in the wording is evident, and an  $\bar{\Gamma}$  could easily be corrupted to  $\bar{K}$  (= καί). We do not know how A. arrived at this number: it appears far too high <sup>8</sup>); but as Plutarch expressly speaks of hoplites, and as we have no reason to doubt that he took from his source just this point, it is wrong in principle to save the sixty thousand  
20 by referring the number to 'the total strength of the army including the armoured bearers, the horsemen and the light armed soldiers' <sup>9</sup>). We do not see how later authors could have obtained this number: light armed men (unless they are special formations) are rarely counted, non-combatants in exceptional cases only <sup>10</sup>). Concerning the further  
25 contents of F 39, A. merely states that the enemies (at the first invasion)<sup>11</sup> spared the  $\mu\omicron\rho\lambda\alpha\iota$ . This does not support the interpretation of Bloch: 'for the rest, Attica was completely devastated: this conclusion must be drawn from the words of A.' <sup>12</sup>). Thukydides 2, 19, 2 gives the sphere of  
30  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\mu\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu$  at the first invasion: the devastation concerned a relatively small part of Attica only. About the  $\mu\omicron\rho\lambda\alpha\iota$  see on Istros 334 F 30. Latte <sup>13</sup>), who correctly says that 'Aristotle ('Αθ. 60, 2) speaks of a restriction of the term  $\mu\omicron\rho\lambda\alpha\iota$  to the trees of the Academy as little as Lysias *Or.* 7 does' might have added A.

(40) A. probably reported the death of Kleon simply as a historical fact and in the same context as Thukydides <sup>1</sup>), whose narrative, perhaps along with the *Atthis* of Hellanikos, he may have made the basis of his whole account of the Peloponnesian War. His date 422/1 B.C., which was probably the same in all *Atthides* <sup>2</sup>), is correct because the year of Alkaios could be found in the list of the strategoi: Kleon fell as strategos

- at Amphipolis τοῦ θέρους τελευτῶντος<sup>3</sup>). The more accurate dating by Eratosthenes<sup>4</sup>)—probably a criticism of earlier interpreters who had moved the death to the preceding year<sup>5</sup>)—that the death occurred eight months before the performance of Aristophanes' *Peace* (in Elaphebolion 421 B.C.) would yield Boedromion, 422/1 B.C. being a leap-year<sup>6</sup>). We do not see how Eratosthenes could calculate this, for the *Atthides* seem rarely to have dated by months<sup>7</sup>). Whether A. in an ἐπιμετρῶν λόγος gave a judgement on Kleon we cannot tell. If he did, there can hardly be a doubt about the nature of it<sup>8</sup>).
- 10 (41) Thukyd. 5, 61, 1; cf. (Ephoros-)Diodor. 12, 79.
- (42) The evidence about Hyperbolos is collected by Kirchner *P. A.* 13910 and Swoboda *R E IX* col. 254. The complete name from the *Atthis* of A. refutes not only the comic poets, who after their custom denied Hyperbolos' Athenian citizenship, but Theopompos as well, who calls  
15 the father Chremes<sup>1</sup>). Though it is self-evident that the Atthidographer was better informed than the rhetor about matters of this kind<sup>2</sup>), the corroboration by an ostrakon with the inscription Ὑπέρβολος Ἀντιφάνους<sup>3</sup>) is welcome. The scholion has been cut down; still it seems to prove what A., who gave his special attention to ostracism as an institution<sup>4</sup>), felt to be remarkable in this its last application, *viz.* that it  
20 affected a leader of the radical democrats. That fact probably made him say that Hyperbolos was ostracized διὰ φαυλότητα, and this suspicion is confirmed by the following characterisation of the man by Thukydides 8, 73, 3 καὶ Ὑπέρβολόν τε τινα τῶν Ἀθηναίων, μοχθηρὸν ἀν-  
25 θρωπον, ὠστρακισμένον οὐ διὰ δυνάμεως καὶ ἀξιώματος φόβον, ἀλλὰ διὰ πονηρίαν καὶ αἰσχύνην τῆς πόλεως, ἀποκτείνουσι (*scil.* the Samian oligarchs) μετὰ Χαρμίνου τε ἐνός τῶν στρατηγῶν κτλ. These words are not a valuation of the political attitude of Hyperbolos (that would have belonged to the fifth book and to the events recorded there), but an occasional remark  
30 which is in agreement with the view of conservative circles on the institution of ostracism and with Thukydides' own opinion of the successors of Perikles, which became more and more severe in the course of time<sup>5</sup>). A. judged like Thukydides, and Philochoros seems to have followed A.<sup>6</sup>).
- (43) In Thukyd. 8, 67 the immediate pre-history of the oligarchic  
35 revolution begins with the return of Peisandros to Athens in the early summer (May?) of 411 B.C., and the Assembly of the people in which the institution of ten συγγραφεῖς αὐτοκράτορες is proposed. Aristotle (*Ἀθπ.* 29) seems to have deliberately made the pre-history as succinct as possible, and dated it by the words μετὰ τὴν ἐν Σικελίαι γενομένην συμφο-

ράν, *i.e.* by the institution of the ten probuloi in winter 413/2 B.C. <sup>1)</sup>. He makes the revolution begin with the assembly in which Pythodoros moves τὸν δῆμον ἐλέσθαι μετὰ τῶν προυπαρχόντων δέκα προβούλων ἄλλους εἴκοσι . . . οἷτινες . . . συγγράψουσι περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας. It has never been denied that the same assembly is meant in both writers, and it cannot be denied in my opinion that the number of ten συγγραφεῖς given by Thukydidēs is an error in a detail which is of no great importance in view of the far-reaching divergences of the two reports <sup>2)</sup>. We need not discuss here these divergences <sup>3)</sup>. Two points only are essential for us: (1) to judge by the wording of Harpokration A. (and Philochoros following him) expressly corrected the error of Thukydidēs: ἦσαν δὲ οἱ μὲν πάντες κτλ. shows that they gave the same composition as Aristotle of the commission of ten probuloi and twenty members elected additionally, and that by πάντες they emphasized this composition evidently because Thukydidēs, who did not know of two successive measures, gave another number. (2) Aristotle in 'Aθπ. 29, 2-3 paraphrases a psephism; a falsification of the psephism in this one point does not appear credible, nor would it have been to any purpose as to the matter; therefore the number given by the Atthidographers and Aristotle is historically correct. Since the number is taken from a document F 43 cannot be used as a *proof* for the dependence of Aristotle on A., but general considerations here too make this dependence appear probable: Aristotle combines Thukydidēs with a 'moderately oligarchic source, which on its part had collected and redacted the records <the full recording of them is typical for the account of Aristotle> with the purpose of proving the legality of procedure of their party <*i.e.* the adherents of Theramenes>' <sup>4)</sup>. The description of this source suits A. We cannot with certainty decide the question whether he on his part took the records from a (contemporary) pamphlet <sup>5)</sup>.

(44) After the brilliant restoration of the date made by Usener <sup>1)</sup> the fragment is of great importance for the design (and incidentally for the style <sup>2)</sup>) of A.s *Atthis* and thus for the design of the *Atthides* generally <sup>3)</sup>. It is further interesting because it shows that Aristotle occasionally remembered the *Atthis* of A. in others of his works besides the 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία <sup>4)</sup>. I think that Usener also correctly restored the more or less corrupt names of the ambassadors <sup>5)</sup> by passing in review the entire tradition of that time for Spartan names. None of the alterations based on this review is graver than is permissible or necessary in so corrupt a text, and the three men appear together in similar positions in other years as well. Philocharidas, who in 423 and 422 B.C. swore to the

armistices and in 421 B.C. to the Peace of Nikias<sup>6</sup>); Endion, who was ephor in 413/2 B.C. and πατρικὸς ξένος of Alkibiades<sup>7</sup>); and Leon, whose official career we can follow up from 426 to 411 B.C.<sup>8</sup>), went together to Athens as ambassadors in 420 B.C. in order to prevent the  
 5 alliance of Athens with Argos δοκοῦντες ἐπιτήδευοι εἶναι τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις<sup>9</sup>), a point of view frequently taken into account in the election of ambassadors. Of these three Leon, who in 411 B.C. took over the command of a squadron in place of the fallen Pedaritos<sup>10</sup>), perhaps died or fell before  
 10 408/7 B.C., and this would explain that the younger Megillos (who is probably identical with the ambassador of Agesilaos to Tissaphernes in 396 B.C.<sup>11</sup>) replaced him. Perhaps we may infer from Μέγυλλος Λακεδαι-  
 μόνιος in Plato's *Laws* that he too was known in Athens and had connexions there similar to those of Endios, though it is somewhat surprising that A. then had mentioned the youngest ambassador in the first place.  
 15 Diodoros<sup>12</sup>), however, called Endios, who in 411/0 B.C.<sup>13</sup>) after the battle of Kyzikos led an embassy to Athens, ἀρχιπρεσβευτής, unfortunately without giving the names of the other ambassadors which surely were not lacking in Ephoros. If we may follow Dindorf in inserting his name in Xenoph. *Hell.* 2, 3, 1; 10 instead of Εὐδῖος and Εὐδικός of the Mss. he was  
 20 again eponymous ephor in 404/3 B.C. and therefore available for a legation in 408/7 B.C. No doubt it is possible with regard either to the date of the mission recorded by A. or to its purpose, viz. the redemption of prisoners on behalf of which an earlier (?) agreement existed<sup>14</sup>). There does not seem a reason for supposing that Ephoros confounded the missions  
 25 of 411/0 and 408/7 B.C., or that he borrowed the name of the ἀρχιπρεσβευ-  
 τῆς of 411/0 from the embassy of 408/7 B.C. The question is alone whether the embassy of 408/7 had instructions, besides the purpose mentioned by A., to sound Athenian feeling as to a peace, as was the case with the embassy of 411/0<sup>15</sup>) and again that sent in 406 B.C. after the battle  
 30 at the Arginusai<sup>16</sup>). We cannot answer this question with certainty because the Scholiast excerpted from A. only the passage referring to the exchange of prisoners, the μῦθς λυτροῦσθα.

(45) The alteration of Ἄνδρων to Ἄνδροτίων is slight, and it is necessary: an *Atthis* by Andron did not exist<sup>1</sup>), and it is not credible that the  
 35 interpreters of Aristophanes should have consulted the mythographical *Συγγέμεια* for a historical event in this instance, and only in this instance, instead of looking up an *Atthis* in which they were sure to find the required data. The problem may have been similar to that of F 40, though in this case there is no real difficulty: at the time of the performance of

the *Frogs* (Lenaia 405 B.C.) Alkibiades was in voluntary exile, but he offered his help to the Athenian commanders even before the battle of Aigos Potamoi (autumn 405 B.C.), and it seems to be a good suggestion of Beloch <sup>2</sup>) that after the condemnation of the generals who had won the battle of Arginusai (October 406 B.C.) the recall of Alkibiades was considered at Athens. The dates given in the scholion, the narrative in which is confused, are those of Xenophon <sup>3</sup>) who puts the return of Alkibiades to Athens in the year of Antigenes 407/6 B.C., whereas it actually happened in the year of Euktemon 408/7 B.C. <sup>4</sup>), and Alkibiades again fell into disgrace in 407/6 B.C. According to the wording of the scholion it was A. himself who corrected the wrong date of Xenophon; perhaps he did the same in F 50, as in F 43 he corrected a wrong statement of Thukydides. Διαφέρεσθαι certainly does not refer only to the account of the return <sup>5</sup>), and it hardly refers to A.'s judgement on Alkibiades, which unfortunately we do not know. As a matter of fact I think that it was not widely different from that of Aristotle.

(46) A. is quoted expressly for the end of Dorieus only. But there seems to be no doubt that he entered at its proper place (under the year 407/6 B.C.) the lucky *coup de main* of the strategos Phanosthenes <sup>1</sup>) who intercepted two Thurian ships which, under the command of the famous athlete, were about to join the Spartan fleet; *i.e.* A. recorded the same events which Xenophon narrates in *Hell.* I, 5, 18 f.: ἀντι δὲ Κόνωνος εἰς Ἄνδρον ἐπεμψαν (*scil.* οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι) Φανοσθένην τέτταρας ναῦς ἔχοντα. οὗτος περιτυχῶν δυοῖν τριήρων Θουρίαιν ἔλαβεν αὐτοῖς ἀνδράσι· καὶ τοὺς μὲν αἰχμαλώτους ἀπαντας ἔδησαν Ἀθηναῖοι, τὸν δὲ ἄρχοντα αὐτῶν Δωριέα, ὄντα μὲν Ῥόδιον, πάλαι δὲ φυγάδα ἐξ [Ἀθηνῶν καὶ] <sup>2</sup>) Ῥόδου ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων κατεψηφισμένων αὐτοῦ θάνατον καὶ τῶν ἐκείνου συγγενῶν, πολιτεύοντα παρ' αὐτοῖς (*i.e.* τοῖς Θουρίοις) ἐλέησαντες ἀρεῖσαν οὐδὲ χρήματα πραξάμενοι. It remains, however, uncertain (1) whether A. related in a digression, under this or under another year, the whole life of Dorieus, beginning with the condemnation in Athens, which probably took place at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War <sup>3</sup>), down to his death in 395/4 B.C. <sup>4</sup>)—an event which rightly puzzled Pausanias or his source <sup>5</sup>), and which perhaps puzzles us even more <sup>6</sup>); (2) whether Pausanias' account of the capture of Dorieus in 407/6 B.C. and of the conduct of the Athenians in regard to him (§§ 4-5) derives ultimately from the same source as the account in § 6 of his execution by the Spartans <sup>7</sup>). Concerning the second question I am as doubtful here as I am in F 58 that Pausanias consulted A. himself <sup>8</sup>). The context in which the 'λόγος' about Dorieus occurs seems to

indicate Ἡλιακά, or a periagesis of Olympia, and/or a book (used in the former ?) Περὶ Ὀλυμπιονικῶν which contained data about the lives of the more famous victors<sup>9</sup>). The learned writers of books of this kind (for which the names of Polemon, Istros<sup>10</sup>) and many others are at our disposal) used, besides historians and local historians, contemporary writings which partly had the character of pamphlets, and which accompanied the struggles for hegemony in the first half of the fourth century: there were not only subsequent attacks on the former Athenian empire<sup>11</sup>), but as many, if not more, directed against the new mistress Sparta; and again there where pro-Spartan pamphlets or speeches published as pamphlets<sup>12</sup>). Possibly this is the reason why Xenophon (who was well acquainted with the wide-spread condemnation of the Spartan conduct) avoided mentioning the death of Dorieus, which did Sparta no credit; but this is not certain, and perhaps not even probable: Xenophon reported the events of the war in their chronological sequence and had no cause for interrupting his succinct account in order to anticipate what was done to Dorieus many years later by the Spartans, after the Athenians had treated him with uncommon mildness. It is also possible that A. (as in F 45) took into account Xenophon and enlarged his report.

But the divergences existing between the accounts of Xenophon and Pausanias, although not of great importance<sup>13</sup>), make it appear doubtful whether the latter can be traced back to A., and the idea of Bloch that 'Androtion, in completing Xenophon's account with the addition of patriotic features, tacitly attacks him by including the story of Dorieus' death', seems to contradict the facts<sup>14</sup>). Also it is natural that for events happening almost in A.s own time he did not need Xenophon as a source; the story of 407/6 may have been, and probably was, mentioned in Hellanikos and Kleidemos, and the contrast between Athenian and Spartan conduct may come from contemporary pamphlets. On the other hand (these matters are, in fact, not so simple as some critics of sources believe), these considerations do not absolutely contradict the idea made likely by the concluding words of Pausanias in § 7, that A. contrasted the brutality of the leading Spartans towards their own adherent with the humane treatment given by the Athenians to a man who in their view was legally condemned for high treason. A., in narrating these things, may have anticipated under the year 407/6 B.C., or (perhaps more likely) he referred back under the year 395/4 B.C. to the earlier story. This may even appear probable up to a point, as A. does not seem to have been a friend of Sparta<sup>15</sup>). But in view of the form of Pausanias'

quotation and of the uncertainty as to his immediate source we cannot *prove* that A. called attention to that contrast, or if so, where he did. It is on account of this uncertainty that I placed § 7 among the Testimonia, and that I made only a cautious use of F 46 in the Introduction <sup>16</sup>).

5 (47) The double citation does not, of course, prove that either A. was following Ephoros <sup>1</sup>) or conversely Ephoros A. The question may remain open whether one of the two alternatives is possible chronologically; but when Ephoros and Atthidographers agree with each other (we do not know whether, or to what extent, that was the case here) there are  
10 generally two possibilities only: community of sources or dependence of Ephoros on an *Atthis*. The battle of Nemea belongs to the end of Diophantos' year 395/4 B.C. <sup>2</sup>), while the naval battle of Knidos was fought in the beginning of Eubulides' year 394/3 B.C. <sup>3</sup>).

(48) The scholiasts on Aristoph. *Plut.* 173 talk at random, but Harpo-  
15 kraton too seems to be excessively abbreviated, as is shown by the singular στρατηγούντος. The ξενικόν in fact consisted of the peltasts of Iphikrates, who is alone mentioned by Diodoros <sup>1</sup>), while Kallias commanded the hoplites who had no share in the actual combat <sup>2</sup>). Cf. on 328 F 150.

20 (49) In the explanation of Alkman's catalogue of wines <sup>1</sup>) we find the following passage in Athen. 1, 57 p. 31 CD: και τὸν ἐξ Οἰνοῦντος και τὸν ἐξ Ὀνόγλων και Σταθμῶν · χωρία δὲ ταῦτα ἴτὰ και πλησίον Πιτάνης. But Boelte <sup>2</sup>) doubts the corrections suggested for the corrupt text <sup>3</sup>) because Oinous is a perioecic township and therefore cannot have been situated  
25 in Spartan territory. Livy 34, 28, 1 says *ad Sellasiam super Oenunta /luvium*. If, according to general opinion, the town was situated on the river of the same name Livy's words might corroborate the information about an invasion of Laconia by Chabrias, and the victory won over the Spartans at Sellasia (?) in 389/8 B.C. <sup>4</sup>), and in the account of Polyainos  
30 the river plays a part. But again Boelte doubts the premiss <sup>5</sup>): he refers to the list of the 'hundred towns' of Laconia <sup>6</sup>), which is quoted repeatedly, and which he would like to derive from A. because 'among the communities mentioned in this list Anthana and Aulon occur, places which the Spartans lost in 369 B.C.'. He finds a corroboration of this view in F 63  
35 'where συγκαταλέγει implies a catalogue'; unfortunately the number of the book is corrupt, and the Mss. of Stephanos diverge: the easier alteration of και (ἐν) into ἐκτωι does not favour Boelte's suggestion; but the ἐν of P may be ε̄, and the campaigns of Epameinondas occurred in the fifth book <sup>7</sup>). I confess that I find strange an enumeration of a hundred



Laconian names in an *Atthis*, but it is perhaps not impossible when we compare Strabo 8, 4, II: *ὅπου γε καὶ ἡ Λακωνικὴ λειπανδρεῖ, κρινομένη πρὸς τὴν παλαιὰν εὐανδρίαν· ἔξω γὰρ τῆς Σπάρτης αἱ λοιπαὶ πόλιναι τινές εἰσι περὶ τριάκοντα τὸν ἀριθμὸν, τὸ δὲ παλαιὸν ἑκατόμπολιν φασιν αὐτὴν καλεῖσθαι καὶ τὰ 5 ἑκατόμβαια διὰ τοῦτο θύεσθαι παρ' αὐτοῖς κατ' ἔτος.*

(50) Xenophon <sup>1</sup>) and Ephoros <sup>2</sup>)—who otherwise differ in their accounts of the events <sup>3</sup>)—gave 300 as the number of Thebans who fled to Athens. Plutarch <sup>4</sup>), who follows a well-informed source, is interested in the fate of the leaders alone while for the mass of adherents he is <sup>10</sup> content with a vague *συχνοὶ ἄλλοι*; he therefore does not help us to a decision. Unless  $\bar{Y}$  is an early corruption of  $\bar{T}$  <sup>5</sup>) (either being, of course, a round number) A. is the best witness because he saw the arrival of the fugitives in Athens. It is quite possible that in this instance too <sup>6</sup>) he wished to correct the latest account of Xenophon <sup>7</sup>).

<sup>15</sup> (51) From an account of the battle of Leuktra which A. must have treated in detail because Athens made the attempt 'at replacing the hegemony of Sparta by her own'. See Beloch *Gr. G.* <sup>3</sup> III 1 p. 172 ff.; Cary *C. A. H.* VI p. 87 ff. For the testimonies about the Eparitai, whom the new Arcadian confederacy set up, see Beloch p. 175 n. 2, and *F Gr Hist* <sup>20</sup> II C p. 99, 28 ff.

(52) Schol. Aischin. I, 77 <sup>1</sup>) *Δημόφιλος δὲ τις εἰσηγήσατο διαψηφίσεις γενέσθαι τῶν ἀστών ἐν τοῖς δήμοις, ὥστε τοὺς δημότας περὶ ἑκάστου τῶν ἀναγραφομένων διδόναι ψῆφον ὅτι ἐστὶν ἀστός, μηδενὸς κατηγοροῦντος μηδὲ ἀπολογουμένου ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς συνιστορήσεως, καὶ ἰσχυοῦν αἱ διαψηφίσεις τῶν δημοτῶν.* <sup>25</sup> Argum. Demosth. or. 57 γράφεται νόμος παρ' Ἀθηναίοις γενέσθαι ζήτησιν πάντων τῶν ἐγγεγραμμένων τοῖς ληξιαρχικοῖς γραμματείοις, εἴτε γνήσιοι πολῖται εἰσιν εἴτε μὴ, τοὺς δὲ μὴ γεγονότας ἐξ ἀστοῦ καὶ ἐξ ἀστῆς ἐξαλείφεισθαι· διαψηφίζεσθαι δὲ περὶ πάντων τοὺς δημότας, καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἀποψηφισθέντας καὶ ἐμμέναντας τῇ ψήφῳ τῶν δημοτῶν ἐξαληλίφθαι καὶ εἶναι μετοίκους, τοῖς <sup>30</sup> δὲ βουλομένοις ἔφεσιν εἰς τοὺς δικαστὰς δεδόσθαι, κὰν μὲν ἀλῶσι καὶ παρὰ τῷ δικαστηρίῳ, πεπραῶσθαι, ἐὰν δ' ἀποφύγωσιν, εἶναι πολίτας <sup>2</sup>). Judging by the date <sup>3</sup>), F 52 is taken from one of the last two books and refers to the last διαψηφισμός, which at the same time is the only one historically certain. It was ordered on a motion brought in by the little known political <sup>35</sup> Demophilos <sup>4</sup>). Διαψήφισις or διαψηφισμός actually means (like the verb) quite generally 'voting by ballot', but (since the events of 346/5 B.C.?) the word was used technically for the ἐξέτασις τῶν πολιτῶν ἢ κατὰ δήμους γινομένη <sup>5</sup>), not only for the regular entering of the sons of citizens into the ληξιαρχικὸν γραμματεῖον <sup>6</sup>)—which in the time of Aristotle

(perhaps as a consequence of Demophilos' psephism) was protected by every conceivable caution—but for extraordinary scrutinies as well of lists of the members of a deme, or a phratry, or a clan ?) with the purpose of freeing these lists from any foreign elements (technically *παρέγγραφοι*).

5 So far as citizenship is concerned, the examination could only be made by the demes because the State registered neither the new-born nor the men who had come of age (*i.e.* the citizens proper), leaving this business to the phratries and demes, of which the demes alone are politically important <sup>8</sup>). Moderns justly find it remarkable that the State did not

10 supervise even the keeping of the lists (or not until the law had come into force which Aristotle quotes in 'Αθπ. 42 <sup>8a</sup>), and even then the State only supervised the entry of the *epheboi*), although the exercising of political rights depended on admission into these lists, and although the lack of reliability of some demes seems to have been a public scandal <sup>9</sup>).

15 The consequence was on the one side the levity with which Comedy and pamphleteers in particular denied the citizenship of almost any man outstanding in public life <sup>10</sup>), on the other that on certain occasions a general scrutiny of the citizens' lists proved necessary, *e.g.* after an interruption of the normal life of the State by a tyranny or another

20 revolutionary action, or after a long war in which, apart from the natural disorder of such times, archives might be destroyed. At least we should think that this must have been the case. But in fact, although we occasionally hear about a *διαψήφισις* by a deme the registers of which had been lost <sup>11</sup>), tradition in regard to an examination of the whole citizens'

25 list (*i.e.* of the registers of all demes) is poor, or rather (with the exception of the year 346/5 B.C.) it is non-existent. I shall rapidly examine alleged cases <sup>12</sup>), only the first of which will somewhat detain us.

(1) Aristotle in 'Αθπ. 13, 5 says that the party of Peisistratos was joined by *οἱ τε ἀφηρημένοι τὰ χρέα διὰ τὴν ἀπορίαν καὶ οἱ τῷ γένει μὴ καθαροὶ διὰ τὸν φόβον· σημειῶν δ' ὅτι μετὰ τὴν τῶν τυράννων κατάλυσιν ἐποίησαν διαψήφισμόν, ὡς πολλῶν κοινωόντων τῆς πολιτείας οὐ προσῆχον*. The statement implies the existence of a citizens' list set up in the time of Solon, and the keeping of it by the phratries, to which from Solon onward the whole citizen body belonged <sup>13</sup>). The absence of any other information

30 about this list is of no great importance <sup>14</sup>). But it is surprising that Aristotle *Pol.* 3, 1, 10 tells us something quite different from the same time, *viz.* not a removal of the unqualified but an increase of the citizen body by foreign elements: *ἀλλ' ἴσως ἐκεῖνο μᾶλλον ἔχει ἀπορίαν ὅσοι μετέσχον μεταβολῆς γενομένης πολιτείας, οἷον Ἀθήνησιν ἐποίησε Κλεισθένης μετὰ τὴν τῶν*

τὴν ἐκβολὴν· πολλοὺς γὰρ ἐφυλέτευσε ξένους καὶ δούλους [μετοίκους] <sup>15</sup>).  
 We can neither reconcile nor separate these two pieces of information;  
 we can only either accept both as being historically correct, or reject  
 both <sup>16</sup>). Those who accept them must regard the so-called διαψηφισμός as  
 5 a measure taken by the reactionary nobility which (as the new Council  
 of the Three Hundred shows) wished to revise the constitution back to  
 the conditions before Solon, and which, moreover, may have had an  
 interest in decreasing as far as possible, numerically and in other re-  
 spects, the Demos, which had been created by Solon, favoured by the  
 10 tyrants, and which was now, through the endeavours of Kleisthenes, to  
 become an active factor in the life of the State. They must then regard  
 the measure of Kleisthenes as a counterstroke of the democratic leader  
 who by enrolments in the privileged body attempted to create in the  
 numerically increased Demos a body of partisans unconditionally loyal  
 15 to his person. Such an interpretation of the tradition can perhaps not be  
 strictly refuted, but the nature of the tradition gives cause for the gravest  
 doubts about its correctness: Herodotos, describing the party-struggle,  
 knows of an expulsion of the ἐναγεῖς only (*i.e.* in fact of the Alkmeonids  
 and their closest adherents), but he knows neither a διαψηφισμός nor  
 20 its counterpart, the increase of the Demos by foreign elements. The  
*Politics* knows only the increase by foreign elements, while the (later)  
*Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* in several passages <sup>17</sup>) knows only the διαψηφισμός and  
 νεοπολιταί about whose quality we are not told anything. As the idea  
 that the ἐναγεῖς are identical with both the disfranchised <sup>18</sup>) and the  
 25 (re-)enfranchised persons cannot be taken seriously, the contradictory  
 pieces of information in *Politics* and in the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία*, in my  
 opinion, are not tradition or historical facts of the closing sixth century,  
 not stroke and counterstroke in the contest of the parties, they are  
 political invention and counterinvention of the closing fifth century and  
 30 of the fourth. The tradition can be explained at once if the information  
 in *Politics* comes from the oligarchic speeches and pamphlets, which  
 attacked not only the democratic constitution but the κατάρατος δῆμος  
 itself, which (as they maintained) had been formed by Kleisthenes pre-  
 dominantly of foreigners and slaves <sup>19</sup>). The other party of course denied  
 35 this slander about the origin of the Demos and refuted it by the invention  
 of an oligarchic διαψηφισμός—not an unskilful invention if they made use  
 of the tradition handed down by Herodotos, and added to it by their  
 invention. Possibly this is already the purely democratic answer, but the  
 main trait of the invention indicates an author who wrote after the

διαψηφισμός of 346/5 B.C., *i.e.* the ordinary source of Aristotle in the 'Αθπ. for the facts of the history of the constitution, *viz.* A., who attempted to free the memory of the μέσος πολίτης Kleisthenes, like that of Solon, from all left-wing, radical, and revolutionary actions <sup>20</sup>). In this party-political controversy the facts were forgotten which we should wish to know, about which however there probably existed no tradition: Kleisthenes created the demes, thus changing the political (civil) status of many Athenians, and determined for the future the status of all Athenians. It was indispensable for him to prescribe to the new units the drawing up, and the regular keeping of, registers of their members. These registers existed besides, or replaced, the former registers which the phratries surely had kept. Naturally they were constantly undergoing changes, but there can be no doubt <sup>21</sup>) that they remained the established basis of Athenian citizenship. We do not know whether any, and if so what, instructions were given in the psephism by which the Assembly voted, on the motion of Kleisthenes, the new division of the country and its citizens. The obvious supposition is that Kleisthenes proceeded like the men of 403/2 B.C. <sup>22</sup>), *i.e.* that he distributed the existing citizen body (or if a more neutral term is wanted, the free population of Attica) among the new demes without a universal examination (which would have taken too much time and could in fact not have been carried through because there was no examining board even later) and left it to the demes to exclude, when drawing up their registers, those who were known to their fellow-villagers or to their neighbours as foreigners or slaves. The oligarchic slander, directed less against Kleisthenes than against the Demos, arose on the analogy to the psephisms of 403/2 B.C.; Aristotle admitted it into *Politics* <sup>23</sup>), and replaced it in the 'Αθπ. by the διαψηφισμός of A., the analogy to the διαψηφισμός of 346/5 B.C. Both pieces of information, being party-political inventions, must be eliminated from history.

(2) The almost universal assumption <sup>24</sup>) of a general διαψηφισμός in the demes in 445/4 B.C. is most probably due to a wrong inference from a statement of Philochoros about numerous expulsions from the citizen body on the occasion of a distribution of corn in that year. It is quite uncertain whether it can even be supported by the authority of Philochoros himself. *A priori* it would be much more likely to expect a general revision of the citizen lists in 451/0 B.C. when Perikles carried his citizen law μη μετέχειν τῆς πόλεως, ὅς ἂν μὴ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ἀστοῖν ἦι γεγονώς <sup>25</sup>); but it does not seem to have been made; the proceedings seem to have

been the same as in 508/7 and in 403/2 B.C. These questions are treated in detail on Philochoros 328 F 119.

(3) The citizen law of Perikles was renewed in 403/2 B.C. on the motion of Aristophon<sup>28</sup>). But an additional motion of Nikomenes, prescribing  
 5 τούς δὲ πρὸς Εὐκλείδου ἀνεξετάστως ἀφείσθαι<sup>27</sup>), expressly excludes a general  
 διαψηφισμός.

(4) The assumption of Wilamowitz<sup>28</sup>) that between 403/2 and 346/5 B.C. 'measures like these without doubt have been taken repeatedly' is due to a failure to recognize the facts of 403/2 B.C. and to the incredible  
 10 dating of Demosthenes *or.* 57 ("Ἐφεσις πρὸς Εὐβουλίδην) at 'c. 360 at the latest'<sup>29</sup>). Before 346/5 B.C. we know isolated cases only<sup>30</sup>), and the tradition about the motion of Demophilos indicates that it really was something new: that is the reason why the contemporary A., and Philochoros following him, treated the διαψηφισμός under this year.

15 (5) The διαψηφισμός of 346/5 B.C. is the first undoubted and indubitable historical fact, established by contemporary allusions<sup>31</sup>), preserved and lost speeches, and especially by the testimonies of the Atthidographers. I have not the least doubt that A. Diller is correct in asserting that 'the decree of Demophilus in 346/5 introduced a great change in the scrutiny  
 20 of the demes: it made them universal, uniform, and compulsory'<sup>32</sup>). For his further assertions, for all technical questions, and in particular for the connexion between the motion of Demophilos and an alleged law (it probably was a psephism<sup>33</sup>)) enabling the Assembly to vote for a universal διαψηφισμός, I refer to the controversy between A. Diller  
 25 and A. W. Gomme<sup>34</sup>). As the 'full' reports of A. and Philochoros are lost we know only that the revision of the lists was general, that it was performed in the demes (this is the only possibility) and without discussion<sup>34a</sup>), and that only some individual cases came before the courts of justice. Of these we cannot estimate the number, which is regrettable because  
 30 of the events of 445/4 B.C. We cannot say whether A. and/or Philochoros on this occasion treated in a retrospective digression earlier (allegedly general) revisions, but we must not interpret in this sense the plural διαψηφίσεις in Harpokration because the wording shows that the plural refers to the votings in the several demes. It seems certain that A.  
 35 described the procedure applied<sup>36</sup>).

It is regrettable that we do not know whether the new measure taken in 346/5 B.C. had a special party-political background. I am inclined to answer this question in the negative<sup>36</sup>); but we cannot identify the mover Demophilos<sup>37</sup>), and we only know from Aischin. I, 86 that he

καὶ πρότερόν τι τοιοῦτον πολίτευμα ἐπολιτεύσατο, viz. against attempts at bribing the Assembly and the courts of justice. As some of these trials were still pending the action cannot have been much earlier. Demophilos may therefore have been one of those well-meaning and short-sighted persons who expect from such measures a purge of public life and a spiritual renaissance of the people of the kind Isokrates demanded in general phrases. At any rate, it is interesting to see the beginning of a restoration, which Lykurgos, and in another direction Demetrios of Phaleron, attempted on a larger scale in order to revive the state of the πρόγονοι.

(53) The wording makes it appear certain that Didymos found the report about the events of 344/3 B.C. still in the *Atthis* of A., although he preferred to copy the report of Philochoros. We must, however, not find in the words δὲ καὶ τότε εἶπε (if the supplement is correct) a testimony of A. about himself: they come from the account which Anaximenes gave of the events. This assumption and the events themselves are treated in detail on Philochoros 328 F 157.

(54) A.s view on Orpheus, which probably criticizes an opinion prevailing in the fourth century <sup>1)</sup>, has been overlooked in *Vorsokratiker* I [66] and has not been sufficiently appreciated by Ziegler *RE* XVIII 1, 1939, col. 1229, 3 ff. Linforth *The Arts of Orpheus*, 1941, p. 160 ff., in my opinion, assigned the proper place to it. A criticism of the existence of a very old poet is not surprising in the fourth century: though Herodot. 2, 53 by his well-known statement about the creators of the Greek Theogony did not expressly deny the existence of the Thracian poet, Ion of Chios <sup>2)</sup> disputed his claim to some, or all, poems under his name; Herodotos <sup>3)</sup> perhaps did the same in another way, and Aristotle speaks of the καλούμενα Ὀρφείως ἔπη <sup>4)</sup>. What is interesting is only the founding of the view on the ethnographical standpoint, by which A. contradicts Plato and Isokrates <sup>5)</sup>. We should like to know whether he was the first to do so, for his procedure stands in no connexion with the widely spread rationalistic criticism of myths <sup>6)</sup>. The old suggestion Ὀρφεία σοφὸν ἔντα Θρᾷκια γεγονέναι, which inverts the sense, is due to a confusion of the view of A. with that of Andron <sup>7)</sup>. A. may have exercised his criticism in the history of the kings, in which Eleusis must have occurred, or in that of the Peisistratids <sup>8)</sup>.

(55) The fragment—most probably from the *Atthis*, not from the doubtful book *Περὶ θυσιῶν*—is not easy to understand because it is so much abbreviated <sup>1)</sup>: the grammarian Aristophanes of Byzantium, who

is quoted shortly before, excerpted the mere fact ἐν τῷ Περὶ ἡλικιῶν, probably on account of the designation of the young animal as ἀπεκτον ἢ ἄτοκον, and Athenaios inserted the passage into a foreign context. Καὶ νῦν is frequently used by the Atthidographers when they are making inferences from the present time as to the past, or in aitiological stories. We might refer the account of Philochoros to such a story, but A. is speaking of permanent conditions, of a custom. It is conceivable that he used the law and the cultic custom in order to illustrate the simplicity and the frugality of the ancients, contrasting modern luxury with it. But sacrifices of lambs and young pigs are quite frequent (and hardly late) in Attic cult <sup>2)</sup>, and I do not understand at all the prohibition of cheese in this context, unless there is some connection with the discussion in Strabo <sup>3)</sup> which probably derives from Apollodoros.

(56) The Lesbian promontory may have occurred somewhere (there is hardly a purpose in guessing) in the historical narrative, in which the sanctuary of Βρησαγένης <sup>1)</sup> was also mentioned. But it is more likely that the collecting grammarian began a new section with *στι*, and if so the name of a local writer may have dropped out.

(57) Schol. Aristoph. *Vesp.* 947 (*Ach.* 703) Θουκυδίδης Μελησιῶν υἱὸς Περικλεῖ ἀντιπολιτευσάμενος, τέσσαρες δὲ εἰσι Θουκυδίδαι Ἀθηναῖοι· ὁ ἱστοριογράφος καὶ ὁ Γαργήτιος καὶ ὁ Θεταλός, καὶ <sup>1)</sup> οὗτος ῥήτωρ ἄριστος τυγχάνων, δς . . . . ἐξωστραχίσθη. In this enumeration the poet has dropped out, whereas in Marcellinus the Gargettian is lacking, whom Theopompos mixed up with the son of Melesias from Alopeke. The enumeration does not come from A., who presumably gave the full name of the son of Ariston somewhere in the narrative, perhaps in an enumeration of officials (*strategoi*?) <sup>2)</sup>. F 38 proves the addition ὁ ποιητῆς to be possible in such an enumeration, and the name of the father may have been added in order to distinguish him from the better known homonyms. We know the poet solely from A. But in my opinion everything cited from Praxiphanes refers to him, not, as is generally assumed <sup>3)</sup>, to the historian, a sojourn of whom at the Macedonian court is reported neither by Marcellinus nor by anybody else <sup>4)</sup>. Busolt <sup>5)</sup> identified the poet with the *strategos* of 440/39 B.C. <sup>6)</sup> and with Θουκυδίδης Ἀχεροῦσιος, ταμίας τῶν ἱερῶν χρημάτων τῶν Ἀθηναίων of 424/3 B.C. <sup>7)</sup>, while Kirchner <sup>8)</sup>, who dates the *floruit* of the poet about 424 B.C., equates the *strategos* with the son of Pantainetos from the deme Gargettos. Kirchner's suggestion may be more likely, for the confusion in Theopompos seems to show that the Gar-

gettian and the son of Melesias were at least approximately contemporaries.

(58) The tradition about the origin of the Delphic Amphictiony has been collected, and its development has been outlined in *Das Marmor Parium*, 1904, p. 33 ff. and *F Gr Hist II D* p. 672, 31 ff. A., in explaining the name, takes his departure from the linguistic meaning, as Anaximenes<sup>1</sup>) does, whose Πρῶται ἱστοροί (Ἑλληνικά) he may have known, whereas the earlier mythographic derivation from an eponymous hero<sup>2</sup>) was supported by Theopompos<sup>3</sup>) (perhaps before A.), and after A.  
 10 probably by Ephoros<sup>4</sup>). The explanation of A. is not common rationalism (as little as F 54 is), but an acquaintance with the linguistic science then beginning, the methods of which Apollodoros used later everywhere in opposition to most of the *Atthides* and other local books<sup>5</sup>). As to Amphiktyon it seems to be certain that the early *Genealogiai*  
 15 almost as a matter of course made him a son of Deukalion, while the *Atthides* which, on the basis of Attic local traditions, brought Deukalion to Athens<sup>6</sup>), admitted the son into the list of Athenian kings probably from Hellanikos onward, Athens thus incidentally becoming the starting-point of the Amphictyony. Neither Theopompos nor Ephoros acknowledged this equation, which is also lacking in the *Parian Marble*, and A.  
 20 (so far as we can see) is free from exaggerated local patriotism here as elsewhere<sup>7</sup>). It must remain an open question whether he expressly criticised any possible Atthidographic predecessor. The chief value of F 58 — which more likely belongs to the history of the Sacred War than  
 25 to that of the kings in the first book — consists firstly in its corroborating the inference as to the local patriotism of A., which we made from the silence of the fragments; secondly in its showing (like F 54) the acquaintance of an educated man with the science of his time.

(59) In the Epitome of Pollux' Lexicon the homicide courts which  
 30 are treated in some detail<sup>1</sup>) are followed, under the inclusive title Δικαστήρια τὰ Ἀθηναίων, by a very succinct excerpt concerning the heliastic courts<sup>2</sup>), the text of which is obviously corrupt in several places<sup>3</sup>). In order to be able to restore the text, and to determine for what A. is cited, it appears necessary to compare all extant enumerations (p. 165),  
 35 which derive ultimately from the same source, *viz.* a treatise about the Athenian law-courts<sup>4</sup>). I have added in the first column a list of all names which we know from Comedy, orators, historians, and inscriptions<sup>5</sup>). This table shows (1) that there existed neither a μέσον nor a μεῖζον Παράβυστον, but only a Παράβυστον pure and simple. It is thus



I. <i>Authors</i> <sup>6)</sup>	II. <i>Pollux</i> <sup>6)</sup>	III. <i>Schol. Aristoph.</i> <i>Vesp.</i> 120 <sup>9)</sup>	IV. <i>Pausan.</i> I, 28, 8 <sup>10)</sup>	V. <i>Harpokratrion</i>	VI. <i>Lexeis Rhet.</i> <sup>11)</sup>
(1) Καινόν (= 13?; 16) 5 [(2) οὐπερ ἄρχων (= 4?)] [(3) οἱ ἔνδεκα (= 5?)] (4) Ὠιδεῖον (= 12)	(1) Ἡλιαία (= 18) (2) Τρίγωνον (= 17; 11) (3) Μέσον (4) Μεῖζον (= 19)	(1) Παράβυστον (= 11 5) (2) Καινόν (1 = 16?) (3) Τρίγωνον (= 11 2) (4) Μέσον (= 11 3)	(1) Παράβυστον (= 11 5) (2) Τρίγωνον (= 11 2) [(3) Βατραχιῶν (—)] [(4) Φοινικῶν (—)] (5) Ἡλιαία (= 11 1)	(1) Ἡλιαία (= 11 1) (2) Παράβυστον (= 11 5) (3) Τρίγωνον (= 11 2)	(1) Ἡλιαία (= 11 1) (2) Κάλλιον (= 11 7) (3) Μητιόχειον (= 11 6) (4) Παράβυστον (= 11 5) (5) Τρίγωνον (= 11 2) (6) Ὠιδεῖον (—) (7) Μέσον (= 11 3)
10 (5) Πρὸς τοῖς τεχνολογίαις (6) Παράβυστον (7) Τρίγωνον — (8) Ἡλιαία (9) Μεῖζον (10) Παράβυστον (= 3; 14)	(5) Παράβυστον (= 16; 10; 14) (6) τὸ Μητιόχειον (7) Κάλλιον (= 113) (8) τὸ ἐπὶ Λύκωι				
20 (11) Τρίγωνον (12) Ὠιδεῖον (= 4) — (13) Κάλλιον (?) — 25 (14) Παράβυστον (= 6; 10)					
(15) ἡ σοὰ ἢ Πουλίχη (16) Καινόν (?)					

called in the Orators (I 10), in the Scholia (III 1) and Lexica (V 2; VI 4) and in Pausanias (IV 1), and it is moreover thus attested epigraphically (I 14). The fact that Pollux too knows only one Παράβυστον results from his note that ἐν μέντοι τῷ Παραβύστῳ οἱ ἔνδεκα ἐδίκαζον. Beside 5 the Παράβυστον stand Μέσον and Μειζον (names as comprehensible in popular language as Τρίγωνον) as separate courts: the Μέσον is attested by the Scholia (III 4) and by Lexeis-Photios (VI 7), the Μειζον by Pollux (II 4) who quotes Lysias. The condition of the text of Pollux can easily be explained: the word Παράβυστον, which had 10 dropped out of the quotation of Lysias, was added above the line, and intruded into a wrong place of the text in the unintelligible form παρὰ βύστου, which does not construe. It is Pollux himself who is to be blamed for the misapprehension, here and under no. 2, because he irregularly sometimes puts and sometimes omits the article. (2) that τὸ Μητιόχου 15 and Κάλλιον are two different courts as well. They are attested as such by several articles in the *Lexeis*, and we may assume that the source of Pollux ranged them alongside of each other, because they had their names not from their shape or size (like the Τρίγωνον and Μειζον), or from their site (like the Μέσον and Παράβυστον), but from the builders, 20 as Pollux himself expressly attests for the Metiocheion, and the *Lexeis* for the Kallion<sup>12</sup>). Τὸ Μητιόχου, which is sometimes called Μητιόχου τέμενος or Μητιόχειον<sup>13</sup>), is as full a name as Κάλλιον is. The connexion τὸ Μητιόχου κάλλιον, in which κάλλιον is unintelligible to me<sup>14</sup>), may not be impossible, but judging by the attestation and for factual 25 reasons it is quite improbable. (3) that we can assign with certainty to A. only the mention of the Κάλλιον. It is possible and may even be probable that the Metiocheion too occurred in his *Atthis*; but we cannot prove it.

Of the builders, whether they erected the buildings out of their own 30 means or were epistatai appointed by the state, Metiochos—for that is his name<sup>15</sup>)—is a man well-known in the life of Athens in the fifth century. At least two persons of good family bear the name, and they were without doubt related, though we cannot ascertain the degree of relationship: (1) the elder son of Miltiades II who was taken prisoner 35 by the Persians in 493 B.C. and who probably did not return to Athens<sup>16</sup>); (2) the politician, lampooned by Early Comedy, about whom Plutarch<sup>17</sup> has preserved the following tetrameters: Μητιόχος μὲν <γάρ> στρατηγεῖ,  
Μητιόχος δὲ τὰς ὁδοὺς, / Μητιόχος δ' ἄρτους ἐπωπᾶι, Μητιόχος δὲ τάλφι-  
τα, / Μητιόχῳ δὲ πάντα κεῖται, Μητιόχος δ' οἰμώξεται<sup>18</sup>). What Plutarch

and the *Lexeis* know about him consists of a description of his character, evidently developed from the lines of the comic poet; the statement Περικλέους οὗτος εἰς τὴν ἑτάρωον which probably has the same foundation; the designation of his profession as ἀρχιτέκτων ἢ (καὶ) ῥήτωρ which by its vagueness clearly shows that its author did not consult an *Atthis*. But he did make statements about the court bearing Metiochos' name <sup>19</sup>) which may come from a periegetic source, the basis of which, however, may ultimately be a contemporary document or information taken from an *Atthis*. We can hardly assume (and this may obtain for A. particularly) that the *Atthides* reported about the origin of temples, cult-images, or votive gifts only, not mentioning other public buildings at all <sup>20</sup>). At any rate, this Metiochos fits so well in all respects that we may confidently regard him as the builder of the Metiocheion. Perikles' introduction of payment for the jurors, the transfer to Athens of the treasure of the Delian confederacy, the jurisdiction of the Athenian law-courts over the allies, and the rise of the Empire generally, entailed such an enormous increase of trials that the creation of new courts of law probably became urgent very soon. We must take these facts into account also for explaining the name of Κάλλιον. Of course, the idea suggests itself at once that the ΚΑΛΛΙΟΝ of the lexicographers is the ΚΑΙΝΟΝ of Aristophanes, but one will as quickly dismiss it. The alteration is slight, but the error would have to be early, since the *Lexeis* and Photios know the Kallion, and their source may even have had the more correct form Καλλίειον <sup>21</sup>). Moreover, the fact that this source mentions a Kallias as the builder of the Kall(i)εion <sup>22</sup>), does not look like a late or like an invention at all <sup>23</sup>). It is regrettable, but it does not matter for the main question, that we cannot tell whether A. gave the name of the builder too, *i.e.* whether he entered the building under a certain year, or which Kallias is meant. Personally I have little doubt that it was the confidential agent of Perikles, the ambassador to Susa, whom we know as a giver of cult statues <sup>24</sup>). But this cannot be proved.

(60) In A.s report about the origin of Thebes there is as light contradiction between a and b, and a serious one between a and b on the one hand and c on the other: διὰ τὸ σποράδην οἰκῆσαι in the scholion on Euripides (a) is not quite the same as διὰ τὸ συμμιγῆς καὶ σποράδας εἶναι of the scholiast on Pindar (b). The latter evidently rendered the source in greater detail and more accurately, for he explains the σποράδας εἶναι, on which the etymology of the name Σπαρτοί is based, by the fact that Kadmos, himself a φυγάς, came to Thebes not alone but μετὰ ἰκονῶν

σποράδων, i.e. other fugitives who had joined him during his wanderings in several places (διὰ τὸ συμμιγές). That is a parallel to the asylum of Romulus, and the hostile attitude towards Thebes here and in F 62, which is particularly comprehensible in view of A.s political standpoint, would be obvious, even if the scholiast had not expressly stressed it (following A. himself?) in the words οἱ δὲ Θηβαῖοι τὰ περὶ αὐτῶν ψευδῶς ἑτερατούργησαν. This is all the more remarkable as in no other of the rationalistic interpretations of the myths do we come upon this bias, which characterizes Thebes, always on friendly terms with Persia as it was, as a rabble of φυγάδες come from the East. The Thebans of A. are anything but σπαρτοὶ τε καὶ αὐτόχθονες<sup>1)</sup>. The value of F 60 consists in showing us A. as a bitter adversary of Thebes: this city with her policy seems to have pleased him even less than Sparta did. Rationalism, so far as we can see, is no outstanding feature in the *Atthis* of A. In this instance it is not the sort of rationalism common since Hekataios and not alien to the *Atthises*<sup>2)</sup>, which simply eliminates matters contrary to nature from the narrative, retaining however the actual mythical event, viz. the foundation of the Kadmeia by the Phoenician Kadmos<sup>3)</sup>; nor is it (as in F 54; 58) merely due to the influence of contemporary science which in the fourth century also applied etymology for explaining away objectionable facts<sup>4)</sup>. Rationalism here is definitely made to serve the political conviction of A., and he may therefore have felt justified in applying the method to this case. It is quite possible that its use became more pointed by open criticism of earlier historians: Hellanikos, who in the *Phoronis*<sup>5)</sup> had narrated the story of the mythic Spartoi not differently in the main from (Aischylos and) Pherekydes<sup>6)</sup>, and who incidentally did not know of Aigeus as one of the Spartoi, may later (in his *Atthis*?) have included the Thebans among the autochthonous peoples alongside of the Athenians, Arcadians, and Aiginetans<sup>7)</sup>.

30 This opinion A., expressly or incidentally, denied by his explanation of the name.

The version of the scholiast on Euripides is clearly a careless abbreviation of the same source and therefore subject to misunderstanding: the σποράδην οἰκεῖν is not peculiar to the inhabitants of Thebes, it is the primary condition of any people, including the Athenians<sup>8)</sup>, before the foundation of the first town. Tzetzes (c), who on v. 1206 subsequently simply copied the scholion on Pindar, is of no use at all. What he says implies the origin from the earth of the Spartoi out of the teeth of the dragon, thus directly contradicting A. and other rationalistic interpreters;

it moreover makes the Athenian king Aigeus one of the Spartoi and thus a Theban. It is not worth while to disentangle the confusion: the account is probably based on one of the numerous discussions about the Theban Aigeidai, for the sake of whom Aigeus, one of the Spartoi, was created, and who also occur in Athens, but not in the *Althides* <sup>9</sup>). No need to argue that this version, negligently compiled from various sources, cannot have occurred, and actually did not occur (as a b prove), in A. <sup>10</sup>); Tzetzes cannot even be used as a foundation for the suggestion obvious in itself that somebody made the Athenian Aigeus one of the Spartoi (we may believe a Theban historian of the time of Epameinondas capable of such a statement), and that A. contradicted him, just as he denied the autochthony of the Thebans. He probably did this in a digression, but we cannot establish the occasion: the time of the kings, when Kekrops organized his country against the Aones-Boeotians and other neighbours <sup>11</sup>), is quite possible, but there are other possibilities. Only the second book drops out, for the eponym of the Kleisthenian Αιγηϊς φυλή was not one of the Spartoi, but an Athenian king and a son of Pandion <sup>12</sup>).

(61) The fragment belongs to the time of Pandion-Aigeus-Theseus and to the dispute about the Megaris as being originally part of Attica, a point treated in detail on Philochoros 328 F 107 <sup>1</sup>). The scholion is shown to be late by calling the Peloponnese Λακεδαιμών, and A. is not cited for the foolish distinction between Ἴωνες and Ἰάωνες. The fourth century writer is sure to have known the Solonian phrase πρεσβυτάτη γαῖα Ἰαονίας, and as surely he regarded Athens as the mother town of Ionia. Nobody ever doubted that the Athenians were Ionians, not even Herodotos when asserting that οἱ μὲν νυν ἄλλοι Ἴωνες καὶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἔφυγον τὸ οὖνομα, οὐ βουλόμενοι Ἴωνες κεκληθῆσαι <sup>2</sup>).

(62) The scholion is a typical ἱστορία. It follows up the life of Oidipus from his begetting down to his death 'giving on the whole the myth dependent on Sophokles in the form familiar to us' <sup>1</sup>). E. Schwartz <sup>2</sup>) judged these ἱστορίαι correctly, and his opinion remains valid even if it is denied or forgotten again and again <sup>3</sup>). We cannot tell a priori what part of the story belongs to A. It is hardly credible in itself that he should have given in the first book or elsewhere in the form of a digression 'a detailed account concerning Oidipus', and the suggestion is made even more improbable by some particulars in the account just in the section referring to Athens <sup>4</sup>). It is possible that A. mentioned on some occasion the tomb of Oidipus and the belief attached to it (perhaps corroborated by χρησμοί) which he found assumed in Sophokles *O. C.* <sup>5</sup>): the most peculiar ending <sup>6</sup>)

gives some probability to this supposition on account of its intensely anti-Theban tendency <sup>7</sup>). Unfortunately we cannot tell what the occasion was: 506 B.C. <sup>8</sup>) does not come into the discussion because the battle with the Boeotians was fought on the Euripos; the *coup de main* of Agis 5 on Athens in 407/6 B.C. seems more likely, as Boeotian troops had a share in it, even if the encounter of the Boeotian with the Athenian horsemen did not occur 'in just the district of Kolonos, into which the road coming from Dekeleia and Acharnai opened' <sup>9</sup>).

(63) See on F 49.

10 (64) The fragment probably refers to the action against Chios by the strategoi Leon and Diomedon reported by Thuk. 8, 24. The place otherwise only occurs in the legend of Homer <sup>1</sup>). The spelling with one σ, which the authority of Stephanos notes from A., has recently emerged in a Thukydidēs papyrus. Βόλισκος given in the Vaticanus of Thukydidēs  
15 and adopted by the editors is probably an ancient misreading of ΒΟΛΙΣ-ΣΟΣ <sup>2</sup>).

(65) Refers to Iphikrates' campaign against Kerkyra in 373/2 B.C.: Xenoph. *Hell.* 6, 2, 37 τούς δὲ πελταστὰς καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν νεῶν ὀπλίτας ἔχων διέβαιναν εἰς τὴν Ἀχαρνανίαν, καὶ ἐκεῖ ταῖς μὲν φίλαις πόλεσιν ἐπε-  
20 κούρει, εἴ τίς τι δέοιτα, Θυρ<ι>εῦσι <sup>1</sup>) δὲ μάλᾳ καὶ ἀνδράσιν ἀλκίμοις καὶ χωρίον κάρτερον ἔχουσιν ἐπολέμει. It should be noted that A. had a different form of the ethnikon, he therefore has not drawn upon Xenophon. The town is called Θύριον and Θούριον in Polybios <sup>2</sup>), the inhabitants Θυρρεῖοι <sup>3</sup>) in inscriptions and on coins; writers mostly call them Θυρρεῖοι,  
25 but sometimes Θούριοι <sup>4</sup>) or Θουριεῖς <sup>5</sup>).

(66) The demotai are called Εἰταεῖοι in the fifth and fourth centuries <sup>1</sup>). If A. actually wrote Ἴταῖος, the form prevailing in Roman times <sup>2</sup>) was in use as early as in the fourth century B.C., but probably the late form is owing to the scribe of the Ms. of the *Atthis* excerpted by the  
30 source of Stephanos—a book Περὶ δῆμων <sup>3</sup>). We cannot guess the Eitaeon mentioned by A. About the question whether he gave a list of all demes see on *Hellanikos* 323a F 6.

(67) If we may trust the accent, A. called the deme Κρῶπες, not Κρῶπαι. In Thuk. 2, 19, 2 it is called Κρωπ(ε)ιαί (κεκρωπιαί C); the form Κρωπίδα  
35 we find in Schol. Aristoph. *Eq.* 79 (κεκρο- R), in Steph. Byz. s.v. Εὐπυρίδα (κρο-, κεκρο- Mss.), and in the inscriptions, which mostly have the demotikon.

(69) The suggestion that the quotation refers to Andron's Τρίπους is rather obvious, and A.'s interest in the history of philosophy seems

to have been inconsiderable <sup>1)</sup>; so I prefer after all to treat F 69 as doubtful, even though the designation of the Seven Wise Men as σοφισταί favours a fourth century writer <sup>2)</sup>. On the other hand, the corruption of Androtrion to Andron is, of course, more likely than the reverse, and it is certain in F 45 <sup>3)</sup>. Still we must not alter Ἄνδρων to Ἄνδροτίων in Strabo 9, 1, 6, although he is cited alongside of Philochoros <sup>4)</sup>. The two citations are not subsumed under the inclusive conception of τὴν Ἀθίδαν συγγράψαντες <sup>5)</sup>, and Andron (of Halikarnassos) occurs in some other passages of Strabo whereas he never quotes A.; we therefore continue to assign the citation to the Halicarnassian <sup>6)</sup>. In Schol. Soph. O. C. 1053 too the alteration is, to say the least, most unlikely <sup>7)</sup>, and in Schol. Hesiod. Opp. 808 it is impossible <sup>8)</sup>. The arbitrary correction of Triclinius, who in Schol. Soph. O. C. 712 altered διὰ τὸν Ἄδραστον into κατὰ Ἄνδροτίωνα, is refuted by *Synag. Lex.* p. 350, 25 Bkr.

<sup>15</sup> (70-71) The Androtrion of Conti is neither the Atthidographer, whom we should believe capable of a book Περὶ θυσίων only on the basis of sound attestations or at least of reliable indications, nor is he Andron, who wrote at least four books Πρὸς Φίλιππον Θυσίαι <sup>1)</sup>. Tresp <sup>2)</sup>, who conjectures and identifies in both citations, did not take into account the nature of Conti, in whom we find a great number of forged citations to be explained more or less easily. The contents of F 70 are taken from our scholia on Sophokles (certainly not from their sources), and the name they give is Andron <sup>3)</sup>. The contents of F 71 are taken from our Etymologicum Magnum which cites Charax <sup>4)</sup>. Conti invented the title *De sacrificiis*, or rather took it from Apollonius *De mir.* 8, a treatise to which he had access. Therefore the Dionysikles in F 71 is not Strabo's <sup>5)</sup> ῥήτωρ ἐπιφανής from Tralles, even if Conti read the name in that writer; he is 'the man who proclaims the glory of Dionysos'. Cf. p. 240, 22 ff.

(72-74) See Introd. nn. 4; 56.

<sup>30</sup> (75-82) See on T 17.

### 325 PHANODEMOS

The name is fairly usual in, and apparently only in, fourth century Athens <sup>1)</sup>. But A. Wilhelm <sup>2)</sup> was no doubt right in identifying the author of the *Atthis* with the Φανόδημος Διόλλου of T 2-5, the collaborator of Lykurgos <sup>3)</sup>. His conclusion rests on the character of the work <sup>4)</sup> which in certain respects is quite as individual as that of Androtrion who probably was his immediate predecessor. Wilhelm further suggests

that the Diyllos, who as continuator of Ephoros wrote in the nineties of the third century B.C. <sup>5</sup>) and who carried his *Hellenika* down to 297/6 B.C., was the son of the Atthidographer. This is confirmed by the note about Δίωλλ[λος] Φ[α]νοδ[ήμου] in the anonymous chronicle (Phlegon?) *5 F Gr Hist* 275 a <sup>6</sup>). These data enable us to determine roughly the time at which Ph. lived.

Neither history, political or literary, nor investigation of sources has paid much attention to this man <sup>7</sup>). He was a member of the Council in 343/2 B.C. and was consequently born not later than 373/2 B.C.; probably <sup>10</sup> the date was a good deal earlier, for he received unusual marks of honour from the Council <sup>8</sup>). In the psephism submitted to the Ekklesia the mention of Ph.s meritorious exertions on behalf of the confederates is remarkable: but what these exertions were we do not know. The Social War of 357/5 B.C., during which Androtion was commander in Amorgos <sup>9</sup>), <sup>15</sup> seems too early, nor does it seem probable that the occasion was the legation of 343/2 B.C. which under the leadership of Demosthenes tried to conclude an alliance with the Peloponnesian states, although Lykurgos was a member of this legation <sup>10</sup>). The Ἰκιακά <sup>11</sup>) obviously implies a special motive, as Ph. did not yet, like Demosthenes, pursue antiquarian-  
<sup>20</sup> philological research as his main object: Ph. may have been commander of Ikos, as Androtion was of Amorgos, and one would preferably connect the book with a date not earlier than the outbreak of the war against Philip in 340 B.C., when the islands off the Magnesian coast played an important part <sup>12</sup>). In any case, in the year when he was member of the  
<sup>25</sup> Council he cannot have commanded in Ikos. In the party-strife Ph.s name does not appear, nor does he seem ever to have held a public office, and this is hardly a mere accident. He had a bias towards matters of religion, and this was bound to bring him to the side of Lykurgos, whose minister of public worship and education one might be inclined  
<sup>30</sup> to call him. In the years from 332/1 to 329/8 B.C. we find him occupied with the affairs of the Amphiareion of Oropos <sup>13</sup>), which had again become Athenian in 338 B.C.: he presided over the commission of Ten which prepared the new penteteris as well as over the *ιεροποιοὶ οἱ τὴν Πυθαίαιδα ἀγαγόντες* <sup>14</sup>); on both these bodies Lykurgos, Demades, and Nikeratos <sup>15</sup>)  
<sup>35</sup> were his colleagues.

With this special attention to matters of cult the character of his *Atthis* <sup>16</sup>) corresponds. In the quotations from it—and we have frequently observed that the grammarians do not quote indiscriminately—the hieratic <and mythological > element so strongly outweighs others that,



were it not for the quotations of Plutarch <F 22/4>, one would hardly believe that he narrated the history of Athens too' 17). We can discern faint signs of moralizing tirades against his own times 18) such as are frequent with Roman annalists; they are appropriate for the helper of Lykurgos, whose tendency to use the antiquities of his country (and of other states) for ethical purposes shows an attitude of mind very different from that of Androtion and Aristotle. Connected with this attitude, and even more prominent, is his local patriotism, reminding one of the λόγοι ἐπιτάφιοι: by referring to obscure local cults and myths 19), and sometimes even without such a starting point 20), he seeks to enhance the glory of Athens. Ph. is not the first to deal thus with tradition 21), but he is so consistent, and certain of his statements stand so isolated, at least for us, that we are bound to recognize in this the special note of his work: Athens is the mother town not only of the Ionians, but also of Troy 22), Sais 23), and probably even of the Hyperboreans 24); the rape of Persephone and the sacrifice of Iphigeneia took place in Attica 25); Admetos found refuge with Theseus, and was settled with his family in Attica 26). Moreover, this panegyric tendency is seen not only when Ph. is dealing with prehistoric times: the exaggeration of the number of ships at the battle of the Eurymedon 27) is of the same nature and to us even more surprising. Consequently we must not infer from this isolated historical fragment the party attitude of Ph.; we must at least ask ourselves whether in his view 'prehistory' extended down to the Peloponnesian War, or, to put it differently, whether he saw the history of Athens during her great time not from a political point of view at all, as Kleidemos and Androtion did, but with the educational bias of Lykurgos, from what might almost be called a classicist standpoint. However this may be, there seems to be no doubt that he wrote his *Atthis* in the spirit, and certainly in support, of the restoration policy 28). Even if the exact date of its publication cannot be determined with certainty, the year 340 B.C. appears to be the *terminus post* 29), and probably Ph. began to write before 335 B.C., and had published the first books when Lykurgos entered on his twelve years 'reign' 338/7-329/8 B.C. 30).

Apart from the book about Ikos, which probably was the outcome of personal experience 31), the literary activity of Ph. is confined to the *Atthis*. This was more than twice as long as the work of Kleidemos; it surpassed in length also the eight books of Androtion: F 8 quotes a ninth book, and there must have been considerably more if it refers to the murder of Hipparchos. That, however, is uncertain, and perhaps one should

rather conclude from F 7 compared with F 25 that the seventh book contained the Pentekontaetia. But as Plutarch quotes the three historical pieces F 22-24 which refer to events between 480/79 and 450/49 B.C. without giving the number of the book nothing can be decided about the arrangement of the work. Supposing F 4 to have been drawn from the account of Erechtheus' reign, the period of the kings was treated at excessive length. But again the supposition is uncertain since a local pre-Kekropian king is mentioned in the fourth book <sup>32</sup>). We shall not doubt that Ph. at least intended to give a continuous account of Athenian history down to his own time, though F 9 is but a weak foundation for assuming this; and we must consider the possibility that he could not fulfill his intention. The latest certain date belongs to the period of Kimon <sup>33</sup>).

Demetrios of Skepsis <sup>34</sup>) and Didymos <sup>35</sup>) made use of the *Atthis*, and it is self-evident that Philochoros knew it, though F 10 is no proof of his having made extensive use of it. The *Ἰκιακά* were doubtlessly known to Kallimachos <sup>36</sup>).

#### T(ESTIMONIES)

(2) Kirchner on *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 227. The first part of the motion of Deinostatos is not a *προβούλευμα* <sup>1</sup>), but calls for a resolution of the Council <sup>2</sup>); the *χρίσις* to which he refers is unique. In 343/2 B.C. a decisive turn in Athenian foreign policy took place: Philokrates was condemned, Aischines accused, Androtion went into exile <sup>3</sup>), and Demosthenes tried to create a Hellenic confederation against Philip. It seems not impossible that Ph. supported this policy in the Council, though his own motion <sup>4</sup>) points to concern with the sphere in which we later find him active <sup>5</sup>). In any case, his religious and 'cultural' interests manifest themselves early.

(3-4) Kirchner on *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 287; 298. About the Penteteris and the Amphiarraia see Preuner *Herm.* 57, 1922, p. 80 ff.

(5) Pomtow on *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 296 'hi hieropoei non pertinent ad duo collegia *ιεροποιῶν* ab Aristotele *Ἀθπ.* 54 commemorata, sed electi sunt ex civibus divitissimis et nobilissimis <sup>6</sup>), ut pompae Atheniensium via sacra Delphos profecturae praeessent. Quos totum populum repraesentasse apparet, quod ex unaquaque tribu unus hieropoeus delegatus est'.

(7) See above p. 172, 18 ff. Even before Athens declared war on Philip in summer of 340 B.C., Halonnesos was invaded and its Macedonian

garrison captured, the attack being launched from Peparethos, which, like Ikos, had since 378/7 B.C. formed part of the Athenian confederation<sup>7</sup>). At the outset of the war Kephison of Aphidna<sup>8</sup>) went with ships to Skiathos<sup>9</sup>). For Ikos see Fredrich *IG XII* 8 p. 17; 166 f.; *RE IX* col. 991; Wilamowitz *Herm.* 44, 1909, p. 747. Strabo 9, 5, 16 *πρόκεινται δὲ τῶν Μαγνήτων νῆσοι συχναί μὲν, αἱ δ' ἐν ὀνόματι Σκίαθός τε καὶ Πεπάρητος καὶ Ἴκος, Ἀλόνησός τε καὶ Σκυῖρος, ὁμονύμους ἔχουσαι πόλεις* with some details about Skyros<sup>10</sup>), but not about Ikos. However in Kallimachos' *Αἴτια*<sup>11</sup>) a ξείνος Ἴκιος<sup>12</sup>) named Theugenes is guest at a banquet of the Athenian Pollis, and is questioned by Kallimachos about the tradition of his island: Μυρμιδόνων ἐσσηνα τ[ί πάτριον ὕ]μμι σέβεσθαι / Πηλέα, κῶς Ἴκιω<sup>13</sup>) ξυν[ὰ τὰ Θεσσαλι]κά, / τεῦ δ' ἔνεκεν γήτειον ἰδ. . . . ῥτον<sup>14</sup>) ἔχουσα / ἥρωος κα[θ]όδου<sup>15</sup>) πα[ις\* \*] / εἰδότες ὡς ἐνέπου[σι] κτλ. In *εἰδότες* Malten detected 'a kind of veiled citation of the source', which can only be Ph., for it seems improbable that there should have existed another book about this insignificant island. As we know of a book about Ikos written by a Phanodemos, there is no reason to doubt that its author was the Atthidographer.

## F(RAGMENTS)

<sup>20</sup> (1) This is not a sufficient foundation for assuming a special book about Delos by Ph. Though such a book would not be surprising either in itself or particularly at that time<sup>1</sup>), F 2, which also deals with Delos, is cited from the *Atthis*. As a title is required for the book by Semos the change of Φανόδημος into Φανόδικος leads in the wrong direction: Harpo-  
<sup>25</sup> kraton quotes Ph. frequently<sup>2</sup>), Phanodikos never. Sauppe's transposition is quite simple<sup>3</sup>): the title *Δηλιακῶν* (which had belonged to Semos) dropped out and was added in the margin, preceded by the catch word ('kustode') ἐν (τῆι) ᾱ; it found its way into the text (as happened often<sup>4</sup>)) in the wrong place. The context of F 1 remains dubious, but the name  
<sup>30</sup> was not explained by Ph., or else he gave an explanation different from the one Semos had offered. In the speech of Lykurgos against Menesaichmos, sometimes cited as *Δηλιακός*, and in the answers to it<sup>5</sup>), much was said about religious antiquities of the island. The speech should be assigned to the period after Chaironeia, and one may suggest that Ph.  
<sup>35</sup> orally or through the *Atthis* furnished Lykurgos with material, even if Lykurgos possessed a wide knowledge of these things himself. Ἐκάτης νῆσος] between Delos and Rheneia; Semos ἐν β̄ *Δηλιάδος*<sup>6</sup>) used this as

the proper name of the island, where βασύναι are sacrificed to Iris. Cf. Hesych s.v. ψάμμην· ἄλιφια; the fish ψαμμίτης<sup>7)</sup>, not being one of Hekate's animals, should not be brought into the discussion.

(2) The γένεσις of the quails for which Ph. is quoted is lacking in this paragraph of Athenaios<sup>1)</sup>, and one does not quite see how it could be discussed in this sentence of the Erysichthon story, in which the earlier name of the island is incidentally explained from the hosts of these birds which rested there<sup>2)</sup>. It seems impossible that Ph. gave a mythological explanation as did the metamorphoses which apparently are not old<sup>3)</sup>.

10 His scientific interpretation, as one might call it, does not, however, simply show that even a pious man could not wholly withstand the spirit of his age, it has been chosen on account of a quite definite fact of cult: the ἄημα παρὰ Διὸς ὧι τε θαμεινοὶ / πλήσσονται λινέαις ὄρνυγες ἐν νεφέλαις<sup>4)</sup> blows in spring (March), and it was in spring, in the Delian

15 month Hieros = Elaphebolion<sup>5)</sup>, that the Athenian theoria went to Delos. It is evident that Ph. introduced the Erysichthon story in connexion with this. According to the list of kings this son of Kekrops and Aglauros, daughter of Aktaios, died childless<sup>6)</sup>, because that list, being an artificial production, tends on the one hand to draw as many

20 Attic figures as it possibly can to Athens, which is not rich in real myths, while, on the other hand, it is obliged to explain why in Athens there is no royal house descending from Kekrops or from Erechtheus. For Plato<sup>7)</sup> Erysichthon is one of those whose δνόματα ἄνευ τῶν ἔργων διασέσωται, but this is not primary tradition. Apart from his name which con-

25 nects him with Erechtheus and Erichthonios and proves him an ancient figure, and apart also from the obscure part which he plays as judge between Athena and Poseidon<sup>8)</sup>, we know now from Delian inscriptions<sup>9)</sup> the clan of Ἐρυσιχθονίδαι, and their ancestor certainly is the Erysichthon who plays a considerable part in the local tradition of Prasiai and

30 (secondarily) of Delos. Ph. probably used the existence of the Delian clan with the distinct purpose of proving that Delos and its cult of Apollo had been dependent on Athens from the earliest times, and this may be the reason for the new interpretations and tendencious alterations recognizable in F 29 and elsewhere. After the action brought by

35 Delos in the Delphic Amphictiony about 345 B.C.<sup>10)</sup> it was most opportune to establish the claim of Athens to Delos by every possible means. The testimonies are (1) F 29 with regard to the direct connexion of the Apolline Hyperboreans with Athens and the altered route of their legation. (2) Pausan. 1, 31, 2 ἐν δὲ Πρασιεῦσιν Ἀπόλλωνός ἐστι ναός·

ἐνταῦθα τὰς Ὑπερβορέων ἀπαρχὰς ἰέναι λέγεται <sup>11</sup>), . . . Ἀθηναίους δὲ εἶναι τοὺς ἐς Δῆλον ἄγοντας . . . ἔστι δὲ μνῆμα ἐπὶ Πρασιαῖς Ἐρυσίχθονος δὲ <sup>12</sup>) ἐκομίζετο ὅπισσω μετὰ τὴν θεωρίαν ἐκ Δήλου, γενομένης οἱ κατὰ τὸν πλοῦν τῆς τελευτῆς. (3) Pausan. I, 18, 5 πλησίον δὲ ὠικοδόμητο ναὸς Εἰλειθυίας <sup>13</sup>), ἦν ἐλθοῦσαν ἐξ Ὑπερβορέων ἐς Δῆλον γενέσθαι βοηθὸν ταῖς Λητοῦς ὠδίσι, τοὺς δ' ἄλλους παρ' αὐτῶν <sup>14</sup>) φασὶ τῆς Εἰλειθυίας μαθεῖν τὸ ὄνομα . . . μόνοις δὲ Ἀθηναίοις τῆς Εἰλειθυίας κεκάλυπται τὰ ξόανα ἐς ἄκρους τοὺς πόδας. τὰ μὲν δὴ δύο εἶναι Κρητικὰ καὶ Φαίδρας ἀναθήματα ἔλεγον αἱ γυναῖκες, τὸ δὲ ἀρχαιότατον Ἐρυσίχθονα ἐκ Δήλου κομίσαι. (4) Plutarch. in Euseb. P. E. 10 3, 8, I (from a learned source) ἡ δὲ τῶν ξοάνων ποιήσις ἀρχαῖον εἶκεν εἶναι τι καὶ παλαιόν, εἴ γε ξύλινον μὲν ἦν τὸ πρῶτον εἰς Δῆλον <κομισθὲν> ὑπὸ Ἐρυσίχθονος Ἀπόλλωνι ἐπὶ τῶν θεωριῶν ἄγαλμα.. (5) Euseb. Hier. a. Abr. 508 (= 46th year of Kekrops) *Apollinis Delii templum ab Erysichthone factum* (*filio Cecropis* add. s. a. Abr. 528 = 9th year of Amphiktyon). 15 Judging from what we know of Ph. <sup>15</sup>) we may derive these accounts from him, either wholly or partly. I have no doubt that in the story they imply he intended to date back substantially the old connexion between Delos and Athens indicated by the *theoria* of Theseus <sup>16</sup>): on the basis of the relations between Prasiai and Delos <sup>17</sup>) and of the existence of an 20 ancient local hero Erysichthon <sup>18</sup>) he made up an invention perhaps even more unscrupulous than the Zoster legend made up by the orator Hypereides <sup>19</sup>).

(3) Pausan. I, 31, 4 τὸ δὲ ἐν Μυρρινοῦντι ξοάνον ἔστι Κολαινίδος· Ἀθμονεῖς δὲ τιμῶσιν Ἀμαρυσίαν Ἄρτεμιν. (5) πυνθανόμενος δὲ σαφὲς οὐδὲν ἐς 25 αὐτὰς ἐπισταμένους τοὺς ἐξηγητὰς εὔρον, αὐτὸς δὲ συμβάλλομαι τῆϊδε· ἔστι Ἀμάρυνθος ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ, καὶ γὰρ οἱ ταύτηι τιμῶσιν Ἀμαρυσίαν, ἑορτὴν δὲ καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι τῆς Ἀμαρυσίας ἄγουσιν οὐδὲν τι Εὐβοέων ἀφανέστερον· ταύτηι μὲν γενέσθαι τὸ ὄνομα ἐπὶ τούτῳ (ς τοῦτο ο) παρὰ Ἀθμονεῦσιν ἡγοῦμαι, τὴν δὲ ἐν Μυρρινοῦντι Κολαινίδα ἀπὸ Κολαίνου καλεῖσθαι. . . . ἔστι δὲ ὁ Κόλαινος, 30 ἀνδρὸς ὄνομα πρότερον ἢ Κέκροψ ἐβασίλευσεν, ὡς οἱ Μυρρινοῦοι λέγουσιν, ἄρξαντος. The doubts of which the ancients complained and which have led the moderns to complete confusion, can in my opinion be easily cleared up <sup>1</sup>). What was wanted was an explanation of the name Κολαινίς <sup>2</sup>): Euphronios <sup>3</sup>) erroneously derived it from the κόλα or κολοβά, 35 accepted as sacrifices by the Amarysian Artemis <sup>4</sup>), and consequently located her in Amarynthos. Modern writers <sup>5</sup>) have accepted this explanation although even the Scholia suggest that it was invented for the occasion, and, on their part, derive the Myrrhinusian goddess from Euboa <sup>6</sup>). They may be correct so far as the Amarysia of Athmonon is

concerned, but this is by no means certain. Another derivation was from the unknown bird κόλαινον (-ος?) παρά τὴν τῆς φωνῆς ὁμοιότητα<sup>7</sup>); a third from Kolainos, who was certainly invented for the purpose. For it is incredible that 'Artemis in Myrrhinus superseded the hero Kolainos'<sup>8</sup>) while it is possible<sup>9</sup>) that Methapos<sup>10</sup>), when introducing his Κελαϊνὸς ὁ Φλόου from Eleusis, thought of Kolainos of Myrrhinus, whom earlier invention had brought to Messene. The following facts are certain: Artemis Amarysia belongs to Euboia and was worshipped also in Attic Athmonon<sup>11</sup>), and Artemis Kolainis belongs to Myrrhinus: the demotai<sup>10</sup> of this deme set up the record of a psephism ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος τῆς Κολαινίδος<sup>12</sup>). It is her story that Ph. (perhaps following Hellanikos) told, but we do not know in what connexion. A chronological account of the kings before Kekrops seems out of the question, Kekrops having already been treated in the second book, and we do not know enough<sup>15</sup> to venture the suggestion that Ph. dealt with the several demes and cities when discussing the division of the country by Kekrops<sup>13</sup>). What we should like to know is whether he was the first to derive the Messenian town from Attica; it would accord well with his bias, and if Kolonides was really not founded till 365 B.C.<sup>14</sup>), it would have been opportune:<sup>20</sup> Pausan. 4, 34, 8 τῆι Κορωνείων δὲ πόλει ἐστὶν ἄμωρος Κολωνίδες· οἱ δὲ ἐνταῦθα οὐ Μεσσηνιοὶ φασιν εἶναι, ἀλλὰ ἐκ τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἀγαγεῖν σφᾶς Κόλαινον λέγουσι, Κολαίνωι δὲ κόρυδον τὴν ὄρθα ἐκ μαντεύματος ἐς τὴν ἀποικίαν ἠγήσασθαι. Even if the town should be older this is not a 'myth', but one of the many tales invented in, or from, the times of Epameinondas in order to<sup>25</sup> connect Messenia with Attica. It is erroneous to regard this quite tendentious literature as '*merely* an unsatisfactory etymology'<sup>15</sup>).

(4) The form as well as the peculiarities of the contents seem to show this account to be a continuous narrative belonging to Ph. He equated the daughters of Erechtheus with the Hyakinthides<sup>1</sup>), not, however,<sup>30</sup> with the daughters of Leos<sup>2</sup>), for the Leokoreion in the market<sup>3</sup>) is not situated ἐν τῷ Ἰακίνθωι καλουμένωι πάγωι, where we must look for the sanctuary of the Παρθένωι. We conclude this to be their cult-name<sup>4</sup>); whether it was applied also to the maidens of the Leokoreion, and whether the stories about the three groups, *viz.* daughters of Erechtheus, of the<sup>35</sup> Lacedaemonian Hyakinthos<sup>5</sup>), and of Leos of Hagrus, hero of the phyle Leontis, are three different aetiological interpretations is a matter for the historian of religion to decide; the stories all have the same motif. In the Atthis—and in the ancient world in general—these considerations did not exist; for them at least the daughters of Erechtheus

and those of Leos are different: [Demosth.] *Epitaph.* 27/29, the author of Diodor. 17, 15, 2 (who is influenced by the speech), and Cicero *De nat. Deor.* 3, 50 mention them side by side as glories of the Erechtheis and the Leontis, and for the sacrificial death of the daughters of Leos, which is nowhere assigned to a certain date, another reason is sometimes given <sup>6</sup>). Also the Hyakinthides and the daughters of Erechtheus are treated separately in as late a book as the *Βιβλιοθήκη*, which does not mention the sacrificial death of the latter: 3, 212 in the war with Minos <sup>7</sup>) γενομένου δὲ τῆι πόλει λιμοῦ τε καὶ λοιμοῦ, τὸ μὲν πρῶτον κατὰ λόγιον <sup>10</sup> Ἀθηναῖοι παλαιὸν τὰς Ὑακίνθου κόρας, Ἀνθηίδα <sup>8</sup>) Αἰγλήϊδα Λουσίαν <sup>9</sup>) Ὀρθαίαν, ἐπὶ τὸν Γεραίστου τοῦ Κύκλωπος τάφον κατέσφαξαν· τούτων δὲ ὁ πατήρ Ὑάκινθος ἐλθὼν ἐκ Λακεδαίμονος Ἀθήνας κατῴκει. It is the same in the catalogue of Hygin. *fab.* 238 and in the source of Steph. Byz. which derives the name of the deme Lousia from one of these daughters. Possibly <sup>15</sup> the source of the *Bibliotheca* is earlier than Ph., though the mention of Geraistos hardly favours this idea; but on the whole Ph.'s tale appears to have been widely accepted. On the other hand there is doubt about Lykurgos who in *Κατὰ Λεωκράτ.* 98 follows Euripides and in the *Κατὰ Λυκόφρονος εἰσαγγελία* F 71 mentions the Ὑακινθίδες, though here it is <sup>20</sup> Harpokr. s.v. who adds the father Ὑάκινθος ὁ Λακεδαίμωνιος. The Pseudo-Demosthenian *Epitaph.* § 27, however, when mentioning the daughters of Erechtheus, expressly adds ἃς Ὑακινθίδας καλοῦσιν; and possibly Philochoros 328 F 12 followed him. The latter may have been inspired by Euripides' *Erechtheus*, where the daughters are transformed to Hy- <sup>25</sup> ads <sup>10</sup>). But Hyads and Hyakinthides are not necessarily the same <sup>11</sup>), and in any case Ph. went far beyond Euripides who did not think of the cult of the Παρθένοι. His identification is certainly not based on the fact that the Hyads dispense rain and the daughters of Erechtheus (or Kekrops) dew <sup>12</sup>). When increasing the number of Parthenoi to six and <sup>30</sup> inventing the names of Protogeneia (evidently the *πρεσβυτάτη* of Euripides) and Pandora <sup>13</sup>), he not only claims for Athens the Hyads, who usually are considered daughters of Kadmos or nurses of Dionysos <sup>14</sup>), but he also removes the difficulties caused by the traditional marriages of the daughters of Erechtheus <sup>15</sup>). Unless the vague phrase στρατιὰ <sup>35</sup> ἐλθοῦσα ἐκ Βοιωτίας means that the Thracians came from or through Boiotia (which is very improbable) the Boeotian war as against the war with Eumolpos and his Thracians <sup>16</sup>) tends to show that Ph. gave an account of the relations between Athens and Eleusis very different from the current tradition: he rejected the Eleusinian war, or he represent-

ed it differently, or even he silently passed it over <sup>17</sup>). His reason for doing so is obvious, but his boldness is astonishing, and again it throws a bright light on the spirit of his *Atthis*. τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἕξ] There are three daughters in Euripides <sup>18</sup>), as there are three daughters of Leos: Praxithea <sup>19</sup>) Theope Eubule in Schol. Demosth. 54, 7 and Aelian *V. H.* 12, 28; four in *Bibl.* 3, 196 and Hygin. *fab.* 46, as there are four Hyakinthides in *Bibl.* 3, 212. According to Euripides the one to be sacrificed is ἡ πρεσβυτάτη <sup>20</sup>), according to *Bibl.* 3, 203 ἡ νεωτάτη; according to [Demosth.] *Epit.* 27 <sup>21</sup>) apparently all are sacrificed, as all Hyakinthides and all daughters <sup>22</sup>) of Leos. The slaying of all except the newborn babe also occurs in Eurip. *Ion* 277/80, unless he assumes the voluntary death of the others <sup>23</sup>). We do not know the names Euripides assigned to the daughters of Erechtheus, unless the names Prokris <sup>24</sup>), Chthonia, Kreusa are derived from him. Ph. invented Protogeneia and Pandora; his remaining four <sup>25</sup>) are the same as in *Bibl.* 3, 196, that is the three of the Anonymus with the addition of Oreithyia, who always has a special position. Kleidemos 323 F 17 mentions Merope, unknown otherwise, and, anyhow, we shall have to assume an abundance of variants and stories about the several daughters incompatible with their sacrificial death, or their catasterism, <sup>26</sup>) and with each other <sup>27</sup>). The material, which is incomplete and might be arranged more clearly, is to be found in Robert *Heldensage* 141 ff. σφαγήναι] to Persephone Demaretes 42 F 4; *Neptuno* Hygin. f. 46. The latter comes from the fact that a Eumolpos was killed in the Thracian war, being a son of Poseidon and Chione. Ἰακίνθωι πάγωι] Steph. <sup>28</sup>) Byz. s.v. Λουσία· τῶν Ἰακίνθου θυγατέρων ἡ Λουσία ἦν, ἀφ' ἧς ὁ δῆμος τῆς Οἰνηίδος φυλῆς. This would mean 'not far to the west of the town' as Wilamowitz <sup>29</sup>) has it, who rightly objects to Valckenaer's alteration of Σφενδονίων to Σφενδαλέων because of *Lex. rhet.* p. 202, 22 Bkr' Αφιδρύματα ἐν ταῖς Σφενδόναϊς· ἀφιδρύματα μὲν τὰ ἀγάλματα, Σφενδόναϊ δὲ τόπος <sup>30</sup>) Ἀθήνησιν; 'the lemma 'A. ἐν τ. Σφ. probably refers to the Ἰακινθίδες'. τῆς τιμῆς αὐτῶν] see on Philochoros 328 F 12.

(5) The quotations are far from certain (cf. p. 240, 22 ff.), and in fact, I repent here (as elsewhere) of not having printed them among the *dubia* and *spuria* on p. 85. In F 5 Conti transcribes *Bibl.* 3, 206/7 or its copyist <sup>31</sup>) Tzetzes Lyk. 494, neither of whom quotes an author. As to the Sphinx (F 5bis), who in the following sentence is called a pirate infecting the coast of Anthedon, Strabo does not even mention her, nor does he say anything about Oidipus except that he was brought up by Polybos in Tenea, a κώμη τῆς Κορινθίας, and this passage occurs in 8, 6, 23. Conti certainly did not find



Φίκιον in 9, 2, 26, where our Mss. have the very old mistake (see Wilamowitz *Pindaros*, 1922, p. 18 n. 1) Φοινίκιον δρος. He evidently draws on one of the Byzantine authors who embroidered the rationalistic version of Palaiphatos ch. 4. Athen. 13, 4 p. 556 F 1) πολυγύναιος δ' ἐγένετο 5 και Αίγεός· πρώτην μὲν γὰρ ἔγημε <Μελίτην> 2) τὴν Ὀπλητος θυγατέρα, μεθ' ἣν <Χαλκιόπην> 3) τῶν Χαλκιδόντος μίαν . . . ἔπειτα τὴν Πιτθέως ἔλαβεν Αἴθραν, μεθ' ἣν Μήδειαν.. Schol. Eurip. *Med.* 673 πρώτην ἔσχε Μελίτην τὴν Ὀπλητος, δευτέραν Χαλκιόπην τὴν Χαλκιδόντος, τρίτην δὲ Μήδειαν 3). Tzetz. *l.c.* πρώτον—Ῥηξήνορος· ὡς δ' ἀλλαχοῦ εὔρον, μίαν ἔσχε γυναῖκα Αὐτόχθην 10 τὴν Περσεώς. Μήταν] 4) 'is no name and is not Attic; it must be emended to Μελίτην' says Wilamowitz. Whether Melite on the Kodros bowl stands for the wife of Aigeus 5) or for the deme of Aias 6) remains doubtful; in any case, Wuest's suggestion 7) will not do. Μήδα would be possible as an abbreviated form of Μήδεια, but Medea is mentioned as being the 15 last wife of Aigeus. Μελίτη is a frequent name 8); about the eponym of the deme see on Philochoros 328 F 27. Her father Hoples is the son of Ion and the eponym of one of the four old phylai 9). 'Ῥηξήνορος] Χαλκιδῶν in Athenaios and Schol. Eur. is regarded as a variant in Istros by Wilamowitz and others. A third variant which makes her a daughter 20 of Alkon (Chalkon?) and granddaughter of Erechtheus also connects her with Euboa 10).

(6) Hesych. s.v. Τριπατρεῖς· οἱ πρώτοι γεννώμενοι. *Id.* s.v. Τριτοπάτορας· ἀνέμου ἐξ Οὐρανοῦ και Γῆς γενομένους· και γενέσεως ἀρχηγούς· οἱ δὲ τοὺς προπατέρας. *Lex. rhet.* p. 307, 16 Bkr Τριπάτορες· οἱ μὲν τοὺς πρώτους ἀρ- 25 χηγέτας, οἱ δὲ τρίτους ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρός, ὅπερ ἐστὶ προπάππους. Pollux 3, 17 δὲ πάππου ἢ τήθης πατὴρ πρόπαππος, ὡς Ἰσοκράτης (—)· τάχα δ' ἂν τοῦτον τριτοπάτορα (τριπάτωρα II) Ἄριστοτέλης (345 R; Aristoph. Byz. F 9 N) καλοῖ. Both explanations—'those having the third fathers', which with Philochoros 1) would mean 'the third down from the original being' 2), 30 and 'the third fathers', that is 'the greatgrandfathers' and thus comprehensively the ancestors 3)—are possible linguistically 4). But according to the sense only the latter, being natural and unspeculative 5), is so. In this interpretation it makes no difference whether one talks of 'the forefather' (which would be the Nordic 'Urbauer' and the Greek ἀρχη- 35 γέτης) or of 'the forefathers'. Again the speculation about 'the Tritopatreus' is of a later date: Index cogn. deor. Cicero *De nat. deor.* 3, 53 Διόσκουροι *etiam apud Graios multis modis nominantur; primi tres, qui appellantur Anaces Athenis, ex rege Iove antiquissimo et Proserpina nati, Tritopatreus, Eubuleus, Dionysus.* The Index has three names like

'Orpheus' and the Exegetikon. Nevertheless, Wuest's suggestion <sup>6)</sup> 'that the cult of the Tritopatores shows a strong admixture of the Orphic element etc.' is baseless; nor, of course, has the 'Typhon' of the Akropolis anything to do with the Tritopatores of 'Orpheus'. At Delos we find <sup>5</sup> Τριτοπάτωρ Πυρρακιδῶν Αἰγυλιῶν <sup>7)</sup>; at Athens ἄρος ἱεροῦ Τριτοπατρῶν Ζακυαδῶν <sup>8)</sup>; at Kyrene Βάττω τῷ ἀρχαγέτα καὶ Τριτοπατέρων <sup>9)</sup>. Evidently there existed numerous cults of clans (or phratries?) <sup>10)</sup> of their own Tritopatores, and at some time the State joined them all together in one cult of the 'Tritopatores': *IG*<sup>2</sup> I 870 ἄρος χώρας Τριτοπατέρων ἄβα-  
<sup>10</sup> τον <sup>11)</sup>. The Attic form is Τριτοπατρῆεις, a trace of which may be preserved in the quotation of Philochoros. About Τριπατρῆεις see Kretschmer *Glotta* 10, 1920, p. 40 f.

Ph. does not say that 'the cult of the Tritopatores' is confined to Attica' <sup>12)</sup>; what he says is that prayers were addressed to them as bestowing <sup>15</sup> the boon of children only in Attica. With this statement one usually connects Schol. BT II. Θ 39 παροιμία· παῖς μοι τριτογενῆς εἴη, μὴ τριτογένεια <sup>13)</sup>. Particulars may perhaps be found in the speculative and syncretistic explanation of Proklos in Plat. *Tim.* 40 E (III 176 D) ὁ θεολόγος· πρώτην γὰρ νύμφην ἀποκαλεῖ τὴν γῆν καὶ πρώτιστον γάμον τὴν <sup>20</sup> ἔνωσιν αὐτῆς πρὸς τὸν οὐρανόν . . . . δ καὶ οἱ θεομοὶ τῶν Ἀθηναίων εἰδότες προσέταττον Οὐρανῶι καὶ Γῆι προτελεῖν τοὺς γάμους, εἰς δὲ τούτους βλέποντες καὶ ἐν τοῖς Ἐλευσινίοις εἰς μὲν τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναβλέποντες ἐβόων ἕε', καταβλέψαντες δὲ εἰς τὴν γῆν τὸ 'κύε' κτλ. Obviously Attic is Aischyl. *Choeph.* 486 (Elektra speaking) καὶ γὰρ χοάς σοι τῆς ἐμῆς παγκληρίας / οἴσω <sup>25</sup> πατρῶων ἐκ δόμων γαμηλίου, / πάντων δὲ πρώτων τόνδε πρεσβεύσω τάφων <sup>14)</sup>. Together with other deities of fertility <sup>15)</sup> the Tritopatores occur in the sacrificial calendar of the Tetrapolis *IG*<sup>2</sup> II 1358 b 30; 51, where they receive their sacrifice πρὸ Σκίρων <sup>16)</sup>.

(7) Hesych. s.v. κύλαστις· ἄρτος τις ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἐξ ὄλυρας. Pollux <sup>30</sup> 6, 73 Αἰγύπτιοι δὲ τοὺς εἰς δεξιὰ ἀνηγμένους ἄρτους κυλληστῆεις (-ιστῆεις II -ηστῆς C καλλιστῆεις A) ὀνόμαζον.. Phot. s.v. κυλλῆστεις (κυλληπεῖς Mss.)· τοὺς δεξιῆς ἄρτους Αἰγύπτιοι. If I have determined correctly the time to which F 8 refers, F 7 may have occurred in the report of Solon's journey to Egypt. In this case one could infer from this passage and F <sup>35</sup> 25 a rather large digression which another author would perhaps have inserted in the Pentekontaetia <sup>1)</sup>. But there always remains the alternative of the unleavened bread of some Attic cult having been compared (perhaps because of its shape) with the Egyptian bread of spelt or barley.

(8) Schol. Demosth. 54, 7 (Hesych. s.v.) ἡρώιον, μνημεῖον τῶν Λεωκόρων

ἐν μέσῳ τῷ Κεραμεικῷ. Phot. gl. 2 (Suda Λ 262) ἐν μέσῳ τῷ Κεραμεικῷ ἡρώϊον· Λεῶς γὰρ ὁ Ὀρφείως υἷὸν μὲν ἔσχε Κύλανθον, θυγατέρας δὲ τρεῖς Φρασιθέαν, Θεόπην, Εὐβούλην, ἀς ὑπὲρ τῆς χώρας σφαγισθείσας ἔτι παρθένους ἔτιμησαν Ἀθηναῖοι τῷ ἡρώϊῳ; *id.* gl. 1 (Suda Λ 261; Schol. Thukyd. 1, 5 20, 2; Schol. Demosth. *l.c.*; *Lex. rhet.* p. 277, 13 Bkr) ἱερὸν Ἀθήνησι . . . ὁ δὲ Λεῶς υἷὸς ἦν Ὀρφείως, οὗ ἐπώνυμος (*scil.* ὁ τόπος Sud) καὶ ἡ Λεοντίς φυλῆ. Ἐν μέσῳ τῷ Κεραμεικῷ 'means the deme, not the market-place' <sup>1</sup>). The story may actually be taken from Ph. <sup>2</sup>), since the connexion with Orpheus agrees with the conclusions drawn from F 4. Unless one <sup>10</sup> assigns an incredible length to the mythical portion of the *Atthis* the ninth book cannot have dealt with the period of the kings; Leos who was not a king <sup>3</sup>) is dated nowhere. The slight alteration of Θ to E is made impossible by the conclusions about the pertinent stories at which we arrived in the commentary on F 4. Therefore the fragment may belong to <sup>15</sup> the account of the murder of Hipparchos *περὶ τὸ Λεωκόρειον καλούμενον* <sup>4</sup>) or, even more likely, to the creation of the ten phylai by Kleisthenes <sup>5</sup>): Ph. is sure to have given the reasons for the choice of the eponyms. In that case F 8 becomes very important for recognizing the arrangement of the *Atthis*: at least five books for the period of the kings, books 6-7 <sup>20</sup> for the period from Theseus (?) to Solon; book 8 the Peisistratids; book 9 Kleisthenes.

(9) In the fourth century B.C. there begins, in the mother country too, the golden age of the music hall performers <sup>1</sup>). We hear of them mostly by incidental or isolated mentions, Xenophon's Philippos <sup>2</sup>) being <sup>25</sup> the first known to us. They have their specialties: that of the Locrian Diopieithes has not, of course, anything to do with the *Λοκρικὰ δίσματα* Athen. 15, 53 p. 697 B <sup>3</sup>). The chronicles of all times have mentioned things like these for their own sake. But as Diopieithes appeared on the stage in Thebes, not in Athens, we may assume that Ph. was criticizing a <sup>30</sup> public which preferred such tricks to serious art, perhaps he even attacked Philip, who patronized such performances. This would, in a sense, be a parallel to Plato's criticism of modern music and the moral lectures of Theopompos.

(10) The νόμος *περὶ ἀργίας* <sup>1</sup>) which is said to have been introduced <sup>35</sup> by Drakon <sup>2</sup>), Solon <sup>3</sup>), or Peisistratos <sup>4</sup>), was still in force in the fourth century <sup>5</sup>). It then belonged to the official department of the archon according to *Lex. rhet.* p. 310, 1 Bkr. *πρὸς τὸν ἀρχοντα κακώσεως ἐλαγχάνοντο γραφαί* . . . *ἔτι δὲ παρανομίας καὶ ἀργίας ἐπιδικασίαι*, but it is not mentioned in Ἀθπ. 56, 5 and its excerptor Pollux 8, 59. It remains doubtful whether

one can infer from the philosophers' anecdotes <sup>6</sup>) that later on (under the 'reign' of the Phalerean Demetrios?) the enforcement was transferred to the Areopagos. The collective quotation does not yield anything for the Atthidographers it mentions <sup>7</sup>). We cannot even tell for certain whether it refers to the actual νόμος ἀργίας: τοὺς ἀσώτους rather suggests a general *cura morum* by the Areopagos, and that is part of the ideological programme the supporters of which looked to the Areopagos for salvation.

(11) Eurip. *Iph. Taur.* 942 ff. ἐνθεν μοι πόδα / ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας δῆτ' ἐπεμψε Λοξίας / δίκην παρασχεῖν ταῖς ἀνωνύμοις θεαῖς / . . . ἐλθὼν δ' ἐκέισε, πρῶτα μὲν μ' οὐδεὶς ξένων / ἐκὼν ἐδέξατ' ὡς θεοῖς στυγούμενον · οἱ δ' ἔσχον αἰδῶ, ξένα μονοτράπεζά μοι / πάρεσχον . . . ἐς δ' ἄγγος ἴδιον ἴσον ἅπασι βακχίου / μέτρημα πληρώσαντες . . . κλύω δ' Ἀθηναίοισι τὰμὰ δυστυχῆ / τελετὴν γενέσθαι, κᾶτι τὸν νόμον μένειν, / χοῆρες ἄγγος Παλλάδος τιμᾶν λεῶν. Kallimach. F 178, 1/2 Pf. ἤως οὐδὲ πιθοιγίς ἐλάνθανεν οὐδ' ὅτε δούλοις / ἤμαρ Ὀρέστειοι λευκὸν ἄγουσι Χόες. Schol. V Aristoph. *Ach.* 961 (*Eq.* 95) Χοῶν ἐπετελεῖτο δὲ Πυανεψιδῶνος ὀγδόη, οἱ δὲ Ἀνθεστηριῶνος <δω>δεκάτη. φησὶ δ' Ἀπολλόδωρος (244 F 133) Ἀνθεστήρια καλεῖσθαι κοινῶς τὴν ἑλλην ἑορτὴν Διονύσου ἀγομένην, κατὰ μέρος δὲ Πιθοιγίαν Χόας Χύτραν. καὶ αὐθις ὅτι Ὀρέστης μετὰ τὸν φόνον εἰς Ἀθήνας ἀφικόμενος (παρὰ τὸν Πανδίωνα, συγγενῆ καθεστηκῶτα, δς ἔτυχε τότε βασιλεύων τῶν Ἀθηναίων Schol. *Eq.* 95) — ἦν δὲ ἑορτὴ Διονύσου Ληναίου — ὡς μὴ γένοιτο σφίσι δόμοσπονδος ἀπεκτονῶς τὴν μητέρα, ἐμμηχανήσατο τοιόνδε τι Πανδίων· χοᾶ οἴνου τῶν δαιτυμόνων ἐκάστω παραστήσας, ἐξ αὐτοῦ πίνειν ἐκέλευσε μηδὲν ὑπομιγνύοντας ἀλλήλοις, ὡς μήτε ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ κρατῆρος πίοι Ὀρέστης, μήτε ἐκεῖνος ἄχθοιτο καθ' αὐτὸν πίνων ἄλλος· καὶ ἀπ' ἐκείνου Ἀθηναίοις ἑορτὴ ἐνομισθῆ οἱ Χόες. Plut. *Quaest. conv.* 2, 10, 1 p. 643 A κύλικα καταθέντα τῶν κεκλημένων ἐκάστω καὶ χοῦν ἐμπλήσασμενον οἴνου καὶ τράπεζαν ἴδιαν, ὡσπερ οἱ Δημοφωντῖδαι τῶι Ὀρέστηι λέγονται, πίνειν κελεῦσαι μὴ προσέχοντα τοῖς ἄλλοις. *ib.* 1, 1, 2 p. 613 B οἱ τὸν Ὀρέστην ἐστιῶντες, ἐν Θεσμοθετείῳ σιωπῆι τρώγειν καὶ πίνειν. The term Χοῶν ἑορτὴ in the excerpt is technically inaccurate <sup>1</sup>), the Choes being, at least in Athens, not a festival by themselves, but only one day of the Anthesteria <sup>2</sup>). The difference as to the Athenian king is probably due to an error: the festival of the Anthesteria, common to all Ionians <sup>3</sup>), was established during the reign of Pandion <sup>4</sup>); Demophon <sup>5</sup>) added the day of the Choes, for the particular character of which Ph., in accordance with Euripides, gives the mythical aition in the style of the Palladion story F 16. With regard to this aition see Eitrem *Beitr.* 3, 1920, p. 40 <sup>6</sup>); Deubner *A. F.* p. 98 n. 6; 99 n. 4; Lesky *RE* XVIII 1, 1939, col. 981;

988 7). For the connexion of Aiora and Erigone—who as daughter of Aigisthos is the accuser of Orestes in the *Atthis* 8)—with the Choes and Orestes see Pfeiffer *Kallimachosstud.*, 1922, p. 104 ff., who also ‘refers the scanty indications of the aition of the Aiora 9) to Atthidographic sources’, cautiously thinking of Ph. ἄθλον] Aristoph. *Ach.* 1000 κατὰ τὰ πάτρια τοὺς Χοῶς / πίνειν ὑπὸ τῆς σάλπιγγος· δε δ’ ἂν ἐκπίη / πρῶτιστος, ἀσκὸν Κτησιφῶντος λήψεται and the scholion on this passage: ἐν ταῖς Χοαῖς ἀγὼν ἦν περὶ τοῦ ἐκπιεῖν τινα πρῶτον χοῶ, καὶ ὁ πῖων (νικῶν?) ἐστέφετο φυλλίνῳ στεφάνῳ, καὶ ἀσκὸν οἴνου ἐλάμβανεν. περὶ τὸν χοῶ κτλ.] It is doubtful whether Hiller *RE* I col. 2375 10) rightly interprets this as being a κῶμος at ‘the end of the Choes banquet’. Aristoph. *Ran.* 209/19 11) is speaking of the Chytrai, and the words ἕκαστον — ἀποφέρειν do not favour such an ending. Apparently—and this would also be more in accordance with the particular character of the rite—on the day of the Choes everyone brought his own cup to the sanctuary in Limnai. The excerptor who was only interested in the drinking contest omitted the ceremony which took place there and concluded the day’s doings.

(12) What Ph. describes here is not a ‘drinking-bout in the streets’ 1), it is a religious ceremony which according to its nature can only take place in a sanctuary. Farnell 2) has clearly and succinctly stated its meaning: ‘anthropology has collected endless examples of such consecrations of the fruits of the field, orchard, or vineyard, whereby taboo is taken off the food of the community before they enjoy it’. The assumption that ‘those mixings and libations took place outside the sacred precinct’ 3) is impossible both in itself and by the description, even more so as Ph. attaches theological observations to it. True, Athenaios says πρὸς τῷ ἱερῷ, and that means ‘near the sanctuary’. I do not raise the question whether it could also mean ‘in the sanctuary’, for if Ph. had meant that he would have said ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ as he did in F 11 4), where both prepositions are used correctly: ἀποφέρειν τοὺς στεφάνους πρὸς τὸ ἐν Λίμναις τέμενος, ἔπειτα θύειν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ. In F 12 also φέρειν requires the destination to be stated: the alteration πρὸς τὸ ἱερόν is slight, and it is necessary 5). As in F 11 the individual Athenians bring their crowns from the banquet of the Choes, so here they bring their casks from their houses in order to have them blessed by the god. Unfortunately the excerpt of Athenaios is incomplete in so far as the name of the festival is omitted, but the contents as well as the mention of the Limnaion show it to have been the Anthesteria when the wine in the casks is ripe for drinking 6); also the ceremony, the significant feature of which is the

ἐκ τῶν πίθων τῷ θεῷ κινρᾶναι<sup>7)</sup>, tells decidedly in favour of the Πιθοίγια, the first day of the Anthesteria<sup>8)</sup>. The theological explanation (these speculations are early<sup>9)</sup>) of the κρᾶσις οἴνου is similar in Philochoros 328 F 5 who has it in its appropriate place, on the occasion of the first appearance of Dionysos in Athens under Amphiktyon, and this dating may also apply to Ph. But Ph. explains by that event the cultname Λιμναῖος of the god who is officially called ὁ ἐν Λίμναις<sup>10)</sup>, whereas Philochoros connects with it the foundation-legend of Διόνυσος Ὁρθός, which no doubt is more accurate. Does this difference support the supposition that the altar of Dionysos Orthos was in the precinct of Διόνυσος ἐν Λίμναις? Εὐάνθη] The alteration into Εὐαν τε is very tempting and in any case not precluded by the conception of Euanthes as the son or grandson of Dionysos<sup>11)</sup>, but Διόνυσος Ἄνθιος of Phlya<sup>12)</sup> warns us to be cautious. There is an Ἄνθιστήρ in Thera<sup>13)</sup>.

(13) Strab. 13, I, 48<sup>1)</sup> τοῖς γὰρ ἐκ τῆς Κρήτης ἀφιγμένοις Τεύκροις, οὓς πρῶτος παρέδωκε Καλλίνος ὁ τῆς ἐλεγείας ποιητής (F 7 Bgk), ἠκολούθησαν δὲ πολλοί . . . . ἄλλοι δ' ἐκ τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἀφ᾽ ἔχθαι τινα Τεῦκρόν φασιν ἐκ δήμου Τρώων, ὃς νῦν Ἐξυπεταίων (ὄξυπέτεων F, ὁ ξυπετεῶν C) λέγεται, Τεῦκρους δὲ μηδένας ἔλθειν ἐκ τῆς Κρήτης. τῆς δὲ πρὸς τοὺς Ἀττικοὺς ἐπιπλοκῆς τῶν Τρώων τιθέασι σημεῖον καὶ τὸ παρ' ἀμφοτέροις Ἐριχθόνιον τινα γενέσθαι τῶν ἀρχηγετῶν. Steph. Byz. s.v. Τροία . . . ἐν Ἀττικῇ κώμῃ, ἧτις νῦν Ξυπέτη (R -ετῆ P-έτι V) δῆμος καλεῖται. Serv. Verg. A 3, 281 *patrias palaestras*] *palaestrae usus primum apud Athenienses repertus est, Troiani autem propter* (FCl *praeter* r) *Dardanum et Teucrum etiam ab Atheniensibus originem ducunt,*  
unde et Minervam colunt . . . nam et Vestam ideo Troiani colunt, quia eadem terra est, terrigenas autem Athenienses nemo dubitat. Dionysios when inserting this particular piece of information into his proof that the Trojans (and thus the Romans) are Greeks, has withheld from us the πολλὰ τεκμήρια of Ph. Ph. seems not to have been the first to invent this connexion, but the reasons preserved by Strabo and others do not warrant Bethe's<sup>2)</sup> high estimate of the account.

(14) The article consists of two parts dealing (1) with the Tauropolos, a parallel version to Apollodoros 244 F II. It fails to mention that Tauropolos was a surname of Athena also, and it overlaps the second, the mythological explanation in connexion with Iphigeneia<sup>1)</sup>, so that this section may belong to the second part; (2) with Iphigeneia. Judging from the sacrificed animal, a she-bear, there can be no doubt that Ph. made the sacrifice of Iphigeneia happen in Brauron<sup>2)</sup>, and consequently also the place of the departure of the Greeks for Troy, a complete parallel (and

perhaps answer) to the claims of Megara <sup>3</sup>). This is confirmed by Schol. V Aristoph. *Lys.* 645 <sup>4</sup>) ἄρκτον μιμούμεναι τὸ μυστήριον ἐξετέλουν. αἱ ἀρκτηύμεναι δὲ τῇ θεῷ κροκωτῶν ἠμφιέννυντο, καὶ συνετέλουν τὴν θυσίαν τῇ Βραυρωνίαι Ἄρτεμιδι καὶ τῇ Μουνυχίαι <sup>5</sup>), ἐπιλεγόμεναι παρθένου οὔτε πρεσβύτεραι δέκα ἐτῶν οὔτ' ἐλάττους πέντε. ἐπετέλουν δὲ τὴν θυσίαν αἱ κόραι ἔκμειλισσόμεναι τὴν θεόν, ἐπειδὴ λιμῶι περιπεπτώκασι οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, ἄρκτον ἡμέραν ἀνηρηκότες τῇ θεῷ <sup>6</sup>). οἱ δὲ τὰ περὶ τὴν Ἰφιγένειαν ἐν Βραυρωνίαι φασιν, οὐκ ἐν Αὐλίδι· Εὐφορίων (F. 106 Scheidw.) ἀγγίχalon Βραυρωνία, κνήριον Ἰφιγενείας. δοκεῖ δὲ Ἀγαμέμνων σφαγιάσαι τὴν Ἰφιγένειαν ἐν Βραυρωνίαι, οὐκ ἐν Αὐλίδι. A comparison of Eurip. *Iph. Taur.* 1446/67 and Pausan. I, 33, 1 shows how events were brought together at Brauron: Euripides (Athena first addressing Orestes) χῶρει λαβῶν ἄγαλμα σύγγονόν τε σὴν· / ὅταν δ' Ἀθήνας . . . μύλησι, / χῶρός τις ἐστὶν Ἀτθίδος πρὸς ἐσχάτοις / ὄροισι, γείτων δειράδος Καρυστίας, / ἱερός, Ἀλάς νιν οὐμὸς ὀνομάζει <sup>15</sup> λεώς· / ἐνταῦθα τεύξας ναὸν ἰδρῦσαι βρέτας, / ἐπώνυμον γῆς Ταυρικῆς . . . Ἄρτεμιν δὲ νιν βροτοῖ / τὸ λοιπὸν ὑμνήσουσι Ταυροπόλον θεάν. / νόμον τε θεῶν τόνδ'· ὅταν ἐορτάζηι λεώς, / τῆς σῆς σφαγῆς ἄποινα ἐπισχέτω ξίφος / δέρηι πρὸς ἀνδρὸς αἶμα τ' ἐξανέτω, / ὅσας ἕκατι θεά θ' ὅπως τιμὰς ἔχηι. / σὲ δ' ἀμφὶ σεμνάς, Ἰφιγένεια, κλίμακας / Βραυρωνίας δεῖ τῆιδε κληιδουχεῖν θεῶι, / <sup>20</sup> οὐ καὶ τεθάρψηι κατθανοῦσα κτλ. <sup>7</sup>); Pausanias Βραυρωνίαι, ἐνθα Ἰφιγένεια τὴν Ἀγαμέμνονος ἐκ Ταύρων φεύγουσαν τὸ ἄγαλμα ἀγομένην τὸ Ἄρτεμιδος ἀποβῆναι λέγουσι, καταλιποῦσαν δὲ τὸ ἄγαλμα ταύτηι καὶ ἐς Ἀθήνας καὶ ὕστερον ἐς Ἄργος ἀφικέσθαι <sup>8</sup>). In view of the fact that Athena, too, bore the cultname Tauropolos and of the several explanations of it <sup>9</sup>) it will be better to leave unsettled the question whether Ph. was the first to equate the Tauropolos with the Brauronia. It is impossible simply to attribute to him the sentence ἢ ὅτι ἡ Ἰφιγένεια — ἦλθεν. Euripides makes a clear distinction: Halai (Araphenides) where Orestes is to find the sanctuary is situated μεταξὺ Φηγέως τοῦ <sup>30</sup> πρὸς Μαραθῶνι καὶ Βραυρωνίαι <sup>10</sup>), Brauron in Philaidai <sup>11</sup>); and Strabo 9, 1, 22 enumerates: Βραυρωνίαι, ὅπου τὸ τῆς Βραυρωνίας Ἄρτεμιδος ἱερόν· [Ἄλαι Ἀραφηνίδες, ὅπου τὸ τῆς Ταυροπόλου. It is at least as possible that Ph. connected the return to Halai and Brauron with the story of the sacrifice in Brauron, and thus explained the cults of two demes. <sup>35</sup> Even more uncertain is the inference from Euphorion that Ph. regarded Theseus and Helen as the parents of Iphigenia, as did Stesichoros, Euphorion, Alexandros of Pleuron <sup>12</sup>), and Nikandros <sup>13</sup>). γραῦν] γραῖαν in Lykophron Wilamowitz <sup>14</sup>) understands not as γραῖα but as Γραῖα, the feminine of Γραῖος, inhabitant of the place Γραῖα, which in his opinion means

*Aulidensis*, because Aulis belongs to the Γραική. This is accepted by Holzinger *Lykophrons Alexandra* p. 196 f. and others, but to me it is not credible.

(15) This fragment belongs to the sphere of the Eleusinian cult, like F 27 (and 28). Daeira is even today one of 'the most obscure deities of the Eleusinian mystery religion' <sup>1</sup>). The one thing certain about her is her home being at Eleusis <sup>2</sup>), where she has been interwoven into the genealogies <sup>3</sup>). Even the conception of Daeira as a 'chthonic goddess' <sup>4</sup>) is founded only on ancient equations, the basis of which remains doubtful: (1) Daeira, the sister of Styx, according to Pherekydes (the Athenian!) —and Styx is the daughter of Okeanos and Tethys in Hesiod. *Theog.* 361 <sup>5</sup>)— seems to be a speculative conception, even if the explanation δαῖρα = ὑγρά οὐσία does not derive from Pherekydes but from books *Περὶ τελετῶν*. (2) Incompatible with the former idea is the identification with Persephone, first known from Aischylos and widely accepted: Schol. *Apoll.* Rhod. 3, 847 κούρην (Δαῖραν GΣ) μουνόγενειαν] τὸ Δαῖραν κατ' ἔλλειψιν ἐστὶ τοῦ ε̄ διὰ τὸ μέτρον· Δάειραν γάρ ἐστι. λέγει δὲ τὴν Περσεφόνην, ὡς δηλοῖ [διὰ] τὸ μουνόγενειαν· νυχίαν δὲ εἶπεν ἦτοι διὰ τὸ χθονίων βασιλεύειν . . . ἢ ἦν νυκτὸς οὐσῆς ἰλάσκονται . . . ὅτι δὲ Δαῖραν τὴν Περσεφόνην καλοῦσι, Τιμοσθένης ἐν τῷ Ἐξηγητικῷ (354 F 1) συγκατατίθεται, καὶ 20 Αἰσχύλος ἐν Ψυχαγωγίς (F 277 N <sup>2</sup>) ἐμφαίνει, τὴν Περσεφόνην ἐκδεχόμενος Δαῖραν. *Lykophr.* 710 with the scholion; *Et. Gen.* (*Et. M.* p. 244, 34) Δάειρα· ἢ Περσεφόνη παρ' Ἀθηναίους· παρὰ τὴν δαῖδα, ἐπειδὴ μετὰ δαίδων ἐπιτελεῖται αὐτῆς τὰ μυστήρια ἢ ὅτι δαῖδα φέρει. (3) Identification with Aphrodite and Demeter is ascribed to Ph. Concerning the former the 25 suspicion of a corruption remains though it may be one of the speculations in the *Τελεταί* unintelligible to us; concerning the latter the etymology δαίς possibly plays a part: *Hy. Hom. Cer.* 47 κατὰ χθόνα πότνια Δηῶ / στρωφᾶτ' αἰθόμενας δαΐδας μετὰ χερσὶν ἔχουσα <sup>6</sup>) (this, in any case, is our earliest evidence). The objection of the Anonymos to Ph. is convincing 30 provided he really gives a fact of cult; and in my opinion this is certain <sup>7</sup>). How the prohibition is to be explained is another question <sup>8</sup>), but the fact exists, and *Serv. Dan. Verg. A.* 4, 58 supplies at any rate a parallel <sup>9</sup>): *nam cum Eleusine Cereris sacrum fit, aedes Junonis clauditur; item cum Junoni Eleusine fit, templum Cereris clauditur, nec sacerdoti Junonis 35 licet gustare unde sit Cereri sit libatum.*

(16) See on Kleidemos 323 F 20.

(17) It is provoking that the lexicographer mentions only what Ph. did not say. Had we been told what he did say perhaps the riddle of *Dikaiarchos* in *Steph. Byz.* s.v. *πάτρα* might have been solved. The *γαμηλία*



has latterly been treated, not quite successfully in my opinion, by Erdmann *Die Ehe im alten Griechenland*, 1934, p. 261 ff.; also Busolt-Swoboda *Staatsk.* p. 960 f. did not consider sufficiently the questions regarding girls and women. Demosthenes 57, 43; (69) only mentions τῶν φρατέρων τούς οἰκείους <sup>1)</sup>, οἷς τὴν γαμηλίαν εἰσήνεγκεν ὁ πατήρ as something apart from γαμεῖν κατὰ τοὺς νόμους. Isaios 3, 76 distinguishes οὔτε γαμηλίαν εἰσήνεγκεν ὁ θεῖος ἡμῶν οὔτε τὴν θυγατέρα, ἣν φασὶ γησίαν αὐτοῦ εἶναι οὗτοι, εἰσαγαγεῖν εἰς τοὺς φράτερας ἤξιωσε, but he speaks of the introduction of the daughter. It is doubtful whether 8, 18—ὄτε γὰρ ὁ πατήρ αὐτὴν ἐλάμβανε, γάμους εἰστίασε, καὶ ἐκάλεσε τρεῖς αὐτοῦ φίλους μετὰ τῶν αὐτοῦ προσηκόντων, τοῖς τε φράτεροι γαμηλίαν εἰσήνεγκε κατὰ τοὺς ἐκείνων νόμους· αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες αἱ τῶν δημοτῶν μετὰ ταῦτα προύκριναν αὐτὴν μετὰ τῆς Διοκλέους γυναικὸς τοῦ Πιτθέως ἄρχειν εἰς τὰ Θεσμοφόρια καὶ ποιεῖν τὰ νομιζόμενα μετ' ἐκείνης—allows of the conclusion that the wife after her marriage was also introduced into the phratry, and then, of course, among the wives of the φράτερες <sup>2)</sup>; that is, whether the mandate given her by the wives of the demotai presupposes an official admittance into their circle. The grammarians apparently were not well informed about these matters: Pollux 3, 42 who does not explain the γαμηλία of Demosthenes quite correctly—ἡ δ' ἐπὶ γάμῳ θυσία (*sic*) ἐν τοῖς φράτοροι γαμηλία, καὶ τὸ ἔργον γαμηλίαν εἰσφέρειν <sup>3)</sup>—uses the same term (whether rightly or wrongly I do not venture to decide) in 8, 107 for the introduction of the marriageable daughter into the phratry <sup>4)</sup> mentioned by Isaios: φράτορες· εἰς τούτους τοὺς τε κόρους καὶ τὰς κόρας εἰσήγον· καὶ εἰς ἡλικίαν προελθόντων ἐν τῇ καλουμένῃ κουρεῶτιδι ἡμέραι ὑπὲρ μὲν τῶν ἀρρένων τὸ κούρειον ἔθουον, ὑπὲρ δὲ τῶν θηλειῶν τὴν γαμηλίαν <sup>5)</sup>. Et. M. p. 220, 50 (cf. *Lex. rhet.* p. 228, 4 Bkr) makes a thorough muddle: γαμηλία· ἡ εἰς τοὺς φράτορας δεδομένη ἐγγραφή καὶ εἰσαγωγή ἐπὶ γάμους, ἣν ἀνόμαζον καὶ κουρεῶτιν· οἱ δὲ φασὶ γαμηλίαν θυσίαν, ἣν ἔθουον τοῖς δημοταῖς οἱ εἰς τοὺς ἐφήβους ἐγγραφόμενοι καὶ μέλλοντες γαμεῖν. ἐγίνετο δὲ ἡ θυσία "Ἡραὶ καὶ Ἀφροδίτῃ καὶ Χάρισι γαμηλίας· Λυκόφρων (*Al.* 323) «καὶ γαμηλίους ἄξει θυγάς».

(18) Et. Gen. p. 306 Mi (Et. M. p. 805, 43; Suda s.v. Χαλκεῖα gl. 2; Eust. *Il.* B 552) Χάλκεια· ἑορτὴ δὲ ἀρχαία καὶ δημοτελής (Eust δημῶδης Et. Sud) πάλαι, ὕστερον δὲ ὑπὸ μόνων ἤγετο τῶν τεχνιτῶν, ὅτι ὁ Ἡφαιστος ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ χαλκῶν (Sud, Eust; om. Et) εἰργάσατο· ἔστι δὲ ἐνη καὶ νέα τοῦ Πυανεψιδῶνος, ἐν ἣ καὶ ἰέρεια μετὰ τῶν ἀρρηφόρων τὸν πέπλον διάζονται. Pollux 7, 105 Χαλκεῖα ἑορτὴ ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ Ἡφαιστού ἱερά. Hesych. s.v. Χαλκεῖα· ὑπομνήματα τῆς τῶν τεχνῶν εὐρέσεως. Sud. s.v. Χαλκεῖα gl. 1

ἐορτῇ Ἀθήνησιν, ἃ τινες Ἀθήνια καλοῦσιν, οἱ δὲ πάνδημον διὰ τὸ ὑπὸ πάντων ἄγεσθαι. For the crude antithesis οὐκ Ἀθηναῖ ἀλλὰ Ἥφαιστῳ the excerptor is responsible, but Ph. did support the claim of Hephaistos (perhaps even as being the primary and only deity honoured), and he was presumably correct in doing so, for the argumentation of Deubner <sup>1)</sup> that Hephaistos did not come in until 'the interest of the whole people in the Chalkeia faded, and it became a special festival of the artisans' seems to me unconvincing both on general grounds and for particular reasons. For his assertion that 'the Chalkeia was celebrated in honour of Athene Ergane' there is no evidence whatever: in *IG*<sup>2</sup> II 674 of 277/6 B.C. the prytaneis of the Antiochis are promised means ὅπως καὶ τὰ Χαλκεῖα θύσωσιν τῇ Ἀθηναῖ τῇ ἀρχη[γέτιδι τ]ῆς πόλεως. Here none but Athene Polias can be understood, and she, not Ergane, is mentioned also in the fragmentary *IG*<sup>2</sup> II 930. The fact that Athene Ergane is the goddess of handicraft in general <sup>2)</sup> does not identify her with Athene of the Chalkeia. If the Athene of this festival bore a particular name it probably was Ἀθηναῖ Ἥφαιστία: her Ph. mentions together with Hephaistos in his motion T 2 b, while the Council dedicates a statue of Hephaistos only <sup>3)</sup>, on the basis of which the entire group of resolutions is engraved. The Hephaistea, too, penteteric from 329/8 B.C. <sup>4)</sup>, show that the time of Lykurgos took a lively interest in that god, and when in the temple of Hephaistos ὑπὲρ τὸν Κεραμεικὸν καὶ στοὰν τὴν καλουμένην Βασιλείον <sup>5)</sup> . . . ἀγαλμά οἱ παρέστηκεν Ἀθηναῖς, this again cannot but be the Ἥφαιστία <sup>6)</sup>. The close connexion of Athene and Hephaistos in Athens <sup>7)</sup> is so old and founded on myths in such a manner that it seems impossible to interpret the information about the Chalkeia otherwise than is done here, the stages being (Hephaistos festival?)—common festival—diminishing importance of Hephaistos—his re-introduction, which was more or less artificial, like so many of Lykurgos' reforms. This last fact is perhaps the only one to be inferred from the rare mention of Hephaistos in later inscriptions.

(19) Pollux 10, 164/5 καὶ ἔταν μὲν ἐν Ἀχαρνέσιν (108) εἶπλε Ἀριστοφάνης ἀχάνας χρυσοῦσιν τὸ ἀγγεῖον ἴσως (*sic*) Περσικόν· ἐνιοὶ δὲ τὴν θεωρικὴν κίστην οὕτω κεκλήσθαι νομίζουσιν· ἐν δὲ Ἀριστοτέλους Ὀρχομενίων πολιτείαι (F 566 R) μέτρον ἐστὶν Ὀρχομενίων τετραράκοντα <πέντε> μεδίμνους χωροῦν Ἀττικούς. Schol. Aristoph. *Ach.* 108 (Suda s.v.; Eust. *Od.* β 291; τ 28) ἀχάνη μέτρον ἐστὶ Περσικόν, ὥσπερ ἡ ἀρτάβη παρ' Αἰγυπτίους· ἐχώρει δὲ μεδίμνους Ἀττικούς μὲ, ὡς μαρτυρεῖ Ἀριστοτέλης. ἄλλοι δὲ φασιν ὅτι κιστὶς ἐστὶν, εἰς ἣν κατετίθεντο τοὺς ἐπισιτισμοὺς οἱ ἐπὶ τὰς θεωρίας στελόμενοι. Συναγ. Λεξ. p. 473, 32 Bkr.

(20) If Ph. really mentioned the μάντεις the reference to the dream of the mother of the older Dionysios, reported by Philistos 556 F 57, is perhaps more likely than a general discussion on vaticination or the history of the eponym of the Γαλεῶται. In Steph. Byz. s.v. Γαλεῶται — 5 ἔθνος ἐν Σικελίαι ἢ ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ ἀπὸ Γαλεῶτου (Schubart γαλω τοῦ? R γαλ' . . . τοῦ VP) υἱοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ Θεμιστοῦς τῆς θυγατρὸς Ζαβίου τοῦ βασιλέως τῶν Ὑπερβορέων, ὡς εἰρήσεται ἐν τῷ περὶ Τελμησσοῦ <sup>1</sup>). τινὲς δὲ 8 ἔτι Γαλεῶται μάντεων εἶδος Σικελῶν <sup>2</sup>)—the variant ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ hardly derives from Ph., notwithstanding the mention of the Hyperboreans <sup>3</sup>).  
 10 It is perhaps altogether doubtful, for in the following story Galeotes and Telmessos, because of a Dodonean oracle, move ὁ μὲν ἐπὶ ἀνατολᾶς (Caria) ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ δυσμάς (Sicily). Considering the scantiness of the historical fragments of Ph. <sup>4</sup>) it would be most important if we knew for certain that he told the story of Dionysios I according to Philistos who discussed 15 the Galeotai <sup>5</sup>) fully. But the supplement γένος τι <ἰχθύων> is very tempting; see on γαλέα, γαλῆ, γαλεύς, γαλεώτης Athen. 7, 43/4 p. 294 C ff. with many quotations; one might even infer from the letter of Lynkeus that the fish occurred in a story about Theseus.

(21) Does this fragment come from a passage about matters of cult?  
 20 (22-23) The two variants quoted from Ph. <sup>1</sup>) allow of reconstructing his report farther and more correctly than has been done hitherto. The short note of Thukyd. I, 100, 1 gives neither the whole strength of the Persian fleet present on the Eurymedon nor the number of ships taken by the Athenians, but only the total loss of 'about 200 trieres'. Plutarch's 25 main source Kallisthenes, having perhaps read superficially, transfers this number to the captured ships and concludes from it ἔτι πάμπολλα τινες αἱ πεπληρωμένοι τοῖς βαρβάροις νῆες ἦσαν. Accordingly we may assume that Ph. had before him the first book (recently published) of Kallisthenes' *Hellenika* which opened with a glorification of the battle on the Eury- 30 medon <sup>2</sup>), and that he replaced the undefined mass of the barbarian ships by the round number 600, which is agreed to be absurd, because it almost doubles the 350 or 340 given by Ephoros. It is not credible to regard this variant as 'the vestige of a controversy between Ph. and Ephoros about the number of the Persian ships', and the 'possibility of Kallisthenes 35 having borrowed from Ph. the fabulous number he introduced as a correction of Ephoros' <sup>3</sup>) does not exist, for Kallisthenes did not mention a total number. F 23 is so short an excerpt that we cannot with any certainty assert Ph. to have contradicted the sequence of events as reported by Thukyd. I, 112 <sup>4</sup>)—siege of Kition, Kimon's death and a famine <sup>5</sup>),

abandonment of the siege, on the way back the victorious naval and land battle near the Cyprian Salamis. As the situation of the Athenians appears critical in Thukydides' narrative too, the words ἀσφαλῶς αὐτούς ἀνακομισθῆναι do not exclude the fact of a double battle on their return 5 journey. Only this is sure that Ph. made use of that critical situation to report a last stratagem of Kimon whom he certainly treated (and rightly too) as the hero of the second period of the Persian War. It further seems certain that he did not replace Thukydides, who as a source was too succinct for him, by Ephoros: the differences from the report of 10 the latter <sup>6)</sup> are obvious. In Ephoros' account Kimon begins by taking Kition and Marion <sup>7)</sup> (Wesseling μαλόν Mss), beats the Persians in a double battle <sup>8)</sup>, and thereupon (θαλασσοκρατῶν) begins the siege of Salamis. Although the Persian garrison defends the town successfully the King considered it more useful εἰρήνην συνθέσθαι πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας 15 and gave the corresponding order τοῖς περὶ Κύπρον ἡγεμόσι καὶ σατράπαις. The peace was concluded by Kallias, and the Athenians τὰς δυνάμεις ἀπήγαγον ἐκ τῆς Κύπρου, λαμπρὰν μὲν νίκην νενικηκότας, ἐπιφανεστάτας δὲ συνθήκας πεποιημένοι. This conclusion, impressive if historically incorrect, is spoilt by an undated appendix: συνέβη δὲ καὶ τὸν Κίμωνα περὶ 20 τὴν Κύπρον διατρίβοντα νόσω τελευτῆσαι. In the narrative of Ephoros this is of no importance in regard to the war: he makes the issue a splendid and undisputed success of Athens—which it is not in Ph.'s report nor in that of Isokrates <sup>9)</sup> nor in the common Athenian tradition which connected the Peace of Kallias with the battle of the Eurymedon <sup>10)</sup>, but 25 it *is* a success in the epigram which Ephoros <sup>11)</sup> wrongly referred to that battle. Plutarch's manner of inserting the variant about the cause of Kimon's death leaves it uncertain whether Ph. was one of the πλείστοι who spoke of an illness <sup>12)</sup>, or one of the ἔνιοι who made him die ἐκ τραύματος, but again it is certain that for the report of Ph. the Peace of 30 Kallias as described by Ephoros is out of the question. Then, however, we shall again be led to believe that here too he followed Kallisthenes who, in consequence of the criticism of Theopompos, abandoned the belief that a formal peace was concluded with Persia <sup>13)</sup>. More we cannot say about Ph., and we therefore cannot deduce either his opinion on the 35 Persian policy of Athens or his party attitude <sup>14)</sup>.

(24) In so far as the place Xerxes chose is ὑπὲρ τὸ Ἡράκλειον, *viz.* on a hill, Ph. is in accordance with Aischylos *Pers.* 466/7 ἔδραν γὰρ εἶχε παντὸς εὐαγῆ στρατοῦ, ὑψηλὸν ὄχθον ἄγχι πελαγίας ἀλός, not, however, with Herodt. 8, 90, 4 κατήμενος ὑπὸ τῷ ὄρει τῷ ἀντίον Σαλαμῖνος τὸ καλέσεται

Αιγάλεως, if the text of that passage is really sound. The Herakleion <sup>1)</sup> is not mentioned by Herodotos either in this passage or in 8, 97; it is also absent in the corresponding passage of Strabo's description of the country <sup>2)</sup> so that we cannot tell if the several conceptions of the place agree with each other or with Herodotos. According to Ktesias—ἐπὶ τὸ στενίστατον τῆς Ἀττικῆς· Ἡράκλειον καλεῖται—it is situated on the narrowest part of the straits on the Attic side, for before the battle <sup>3)</sup> it is from here that Xerxes intends to build a causeway <sup>4)</sup>; that would mean according to Strabo's description between the ἄκρα ἢ Ἀμφιάλη, the spur of Korydallos with the quarry above it, and the two small isles called Pharmakussai. Also according to Ephoros the Greek fleet is placed κατὰ τὸν πόρον μεταξύ Σαλαμῖνος καὶ Ἡρακλείου, and the King εἰς τὸν ἐναντίον Σαλαμῖνος τόπον (λόφον Rei) παρῆλθεν, ἐξ οὗ θεωρεῖν ἦν τὴν ναυμαχίαν γενομένην. Aristodemos, whose source in all probability is Ephoros, reports about the intended ζεύγμα before the battle: καὶ μέρος <sup>5)</sup> τι ἔχων ἦκεν κατὰ τὸ Ἡράκλειον <sup>6)</sup>; when this fails καθεζόμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ Πάρνηθος ὄρους <sup>7)</sup>—ἐγγὺς δὲ ἦν τοῦτο—ἑώρα τὴν ναυμαχίαν. Akestodoros does not help. He may have been in possession of some local tradition, but none of the facts adduced by Macan <sup>8)</sup> brings us near to the Κέρατα. The χρυσοῦς δίφρος <sup>9)</sup> certainly occurred in Ph. too, also the γραμματεῖς of Herodt. 8, 90, 9 are possible for him, not, however, the human sacrifice offered by the Athenians before the battle, for which Plutarch. *Them.* 13, 2-5 quotes Phantias.

(25) Plato *Tim.* 21 Ε μεγίστη πόλις Σάις, ὅθεν καὶ δὴ Ἄμασις ἦν ὁ βασιλεὺς, οἷς τῆς πόλεως θεὸς ἀρχηγός τις ἐστίν, Αἰγυπτιστὶ μὲν τοῦνομα Νηίθ, Ἑλληνιστὶ δὲ, ὡς ὁ ἐκείνων λόγος, Ἀθηναῖα. μάλα δὲ φιλαθηναῖοι καὶ τινα τρόπον οἰκεῖοι τῶνδ' εἶναι φασιν· οἱ δὲ Σόλων ἐφη πορευθεὶς σφόδρα τε γένησθαι παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐντιμος κτλ. The identification of Neith and Athena is already known to Herodt. 2, 59; 169/70 <sup>1)</sup>, and it is to Amasis that Solon comes in Herodt. 1, 30, 1 <sup>2)</sup>. From Plato's guarded expression (which in itself does not justify the interpretation of Philostratos *εpp.* 70; I 364, 32 K: Ἀθηναίων ἀπόγονοί ἐστε, καθάπερ ἐν Τιμαίῳ Πλάτων φησίν), Anaximenes <sup>3)</sup> was the first to infer (no doubt with malicious intent) in the *Trikaranos*, which he foisted on Theopompos before 336 B.C., a dependence of Athens on Sais. Without such evil intention, but in accordance with his bias towards political philosophy <sup>4)</sup>, Hekataios of Abdera before 315/4 B.C. <sup>5)</sup> develops Plato's words by representing as Egyptians a whole series of Athenian kings and Eleusinian families <sup>6)</sup>. The opposite view of Ph. <sup>7)</sup>, which he presumably set forth circumstantially, may

Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.)

have been an answer to the sensational *Trikaranos*. We have no evidence that Kallisthenes followed Ph., though it is chronologically possible that he did, even if he discussed the relations between Athens and Sais in the digression about Egypt in the fourth book <sup>8)</sup> of his *Hellenika*, published in 343/35 B.C. As Ph. on his part drew upon the first book of the *Hellenika* in one of the last books of his *Atthis* <sup>9)</sup> we observe—  
 5 not for the first time in Atthidography—a consideration of the most recent literature by both writers, which ought not to surprise anybody. Even assuming that Ph. was used by Kallisthenes in this instance, we  
 10 cannot decide whether he discussed this disputed point in one of his first books under Kekrops, or later in the digression about Egypt in his seventh book <sup>10)</sup>.

(26) The Ammonios mentioned in the scholion is most probably not the author of the book *Περὶ βωμῶν καὶ θυσιῶν* (no. 361) but the gram-  
 15 marian of Alexandria who wrote *Κωμωιδούμενοι*. It seems even more certain that Ph. did not reproduce Attic tradition <sup>1)</sup> in which there is no room for Admetos and in which he plays no part; we may well believe this Atthidographer capable of having simply invented—on the back-  
 20 ground of Thukyd. I, 2, 6?—the expulsion of Admetos and his reception by the ever hospitable Theseus for the greater glory of Athens. The story is as unique as other features of this *Atthis* which quite obviously are patriotic inventions; Eurip. *Alk.* 210 οὐ γάρ τι πάντες εὖ φρονούσι κοιρά-  
 νοις is indeed not a foundation for it <sup>2)</sup>, and Parthen. *Narr. am.* 5, 6 has been completely misinterpreted by Engelmann *Rosch. Lex.* I col.  
 25 69. The name Hippiasos for the 'youngest child', not otherwise attested, is extremely frequent for mostly quite vague heroes <sup>3)</sup>. There is only a weak connexion between Admetos and Athens in the person of another son Eumelos, one of the forbears of the later king Melanthos who 'Ἡρα-  
 κλειδῶν ἐπιόντων ἐκ Μεσσήνης εἰς Ἀθήνας ὑπεχώρησε, καὶ αὐτῶι γίνεται παῖς  
 30 Κόδρος <sup>4)</sup>; and this Eumelos we also find in the pedigree of the Thessalian Theseus, who was among the founders of Kyme in the Aiolis and Smyrna <sup>5)</sup>. The δεκατευθέντες ἐκ Φερῶν ὑπ' Ἀδμήτου in the history of the  
 foundation of Ephesos <sup>6)</sup> point towards Ionia, not towards Athens. One may well ask whether Ph. had any other support for bringing  
 35 Admetos himself to Athens apart from the skolion, which Bowra <sup>7)</sup> dates in the last years of Hippias. Of Alkestis there is no vestige in Athens at all. Against L. Weber's indefatigably repeated fantasies <sup>8)</sup> about Eurip. *Alk.* 445/54 — πολλά σε μουσοπόλοι μέλψουσι καθ' ἑπτάτονόν τ' ὄρειαν χέλυον ἐν  
 τ' ἀλύροις κλέοντες ὕμνοις, Σπάρται κύκλος ἀνίκα Καρνείου περιπίσσεται ὥρας

μηρός, ἀειρομένης παννύχου σελάνας, λιπαραῖσι τ' ἐν ὀλβίαις Ἀθάνας — it should be sufficient to refer to Lesky's treatment of the Alkestis legend<sup>9</sup>). Whatever is behind the conception of Alkestis in Sparta<sup>10</sup>), as far as Athens is concerned one not only may consider 'the possibility of Euripides having in view his own play'<sup>11</sup>), one must take it for granted.

(27) Pausan. I, 38, 5 ρεῖ δὲ Κηφισὸς πρὸς Ἐλευσίνι βιαιότερον παρεχόμενος τοῦ προτέρου ρεῦμα, καὶ παρ' αὐτῶι καλοῦσιν Ἐρινεόν, λέγοντες τὸν Πλούτωνα ὅτε ἤρπασε τὴν Κόρην καταβῆναι ταύτῃ<sup>1</sup>). Schol. Soph. *O. K.* 1590 and 1592 δν ἐν ἀρχῇ (v. 57) εἶπε »γαλιόπου ὁδὸν . . . νῦν καταρράκτην προσηγόρευσε διὰ τὸ νομίζειν ἐκείνον τὸν τόπον καταβάσιον εἶναι εἰς Ἄιδου, καὶ εἰσιν οἱ δι' αὐτῆς τὴν ἀρπαγὴν φασὶ τῆς Κόρης γενέσθαι. Other Athenian localisations<sup>2</sup>) on the Pnyx, near the Thesmophorion<sup>3</sup>) and Barathron, founded on Schol. Lukian. *Dial. mer.* 2, 1 p. 275, 23 R and Schol. Aristoph. *Plut.* 431, or 'in the caves of the Akropolis rock of Eleusis near the so-called Plutonion'<sup>4</sup>) are less certain. We may also leave aside the combination, made not very skilfully, of Persephone being kidnapped from a meadow somewhere and brought over the sea to Attica: *Hymn. Orph.* 18, 12 ff. Εὔβουλ', ἀγνοπόλου Δημήτερος ὅς ποτε παῖδα νυμφεύσας λειμώνος ἀποσπαδίην διὰ πόντου τετρώροις ἱπποῖσιν ὑπ' Ἀτθίδος ἤγαγεσ ἄντρον δήμου Ἐλευσίνος, τόθι περ πύλαι εἰς Ἄϊδαο. In the Homeric (Attic) *Hymn. Dem.* 91 ff., the Atthis of *Marm. Par.* 239 A 12/4, and the general tradition<sup>5</sup>) Eleusis merely claims the reception of the goddess seeking for her lost daughter, with which are connected a series of facts of the Eleusinian cult—in the first place the establishment of the mysteries and other customs<sup>6</sup>), and later the 'invention' of corn and the first sowing and reaping<sup>7</sup>). It was probably the Orphic history of Demeter which in the sixth or fifth century B.C. transferred the rape itself to Eleusis<sup>8</sup>).

The scholion on Hesiod assigns to Ph. merely the naked fact of the rape having taken place in Attica; it has probably lost much of the learned character it originally had: the list of variants is by no means complete<sup>9</sup>). True, most of them are concerned with the reception of Demeter only<sup>10</sup>); also the age of many is doubtful. But the tradition of Hermione for example<sup>11</sup>), now connected with the γῆς χάσμα, διὰ τούτου δὲ Ἡρακλῆς ἀνήγε τοῦ Ἄιδου τὸν κύνα κατὰ τὰ λεγόμενα ὑπὸ Ἐρμιονέων, presumably referred to the rape too. From the point of view of the cult the reception of Demeter is more important than the place of the rape. Not only Hesiod *Th.* 912/4, who anyhow does not care about terrestrial localities, leaves it unmentioned, but so does the Attic

hymn, which presumably inspired 'Orpheus'; for the Okeanos—and Persephone is carried off *παίζουσα κούρησι σὺν Ὀκεανοῦ βαθυκόλοισι λειμῶν' ἀμ μαλακόν* <sup>13</sup>)—is quite as much out of the world as the *Νύστιον πεδίον* of Hy. Hom. v. 17. That, of course, must not be altered to *μέσσατον*, *νείατον* or suchlike, whereas Malten's *Μύστιον* <sup>13</sup>) is well worth considering. According to Pherekydes 3 F 53, who is greatly influenced by Attic tradition, Triptolemos is the son of Okeanos and Ge. The scholion enumerates the three main claimants to the invention of the cultivation of grain (which means practically the whole myth) before later writers had reconciled the several claims—Sicily <sup>14</sup>), Crete <sup>15</sup>), Attica. The fourth country ought to be Egypt, or even Argos, but the conclusion is corrupt and cannot be restored <sup>16</sup>); an Attic locality is out of the question, even if the author should prove to be Demades after all.

(28) Diog. *Prov.* 8, 39; *Prov. Alex.* 8 p. 20 Cr. The small surplus sentence extant in the Parisinus, which one would like to refer to the *Νεκύσια* <sup>1</sup>), is so corrupt that nothing can be done with it. *Πάνδημος ἑορτή* is as unconvincing as *πάνδημος* = *δημώδης* <sup>2</sup>); *πένθιμος* <sup>3</sup>) does not help either; and *Φανόδημος*, whom Wilamowitz <sup>4</sup>) introduced without offering a reason, is not favoured by the corrupt articles in Hesych. s.v. *νέκες* <sup>5</sup>)· *νεκροί· νε>ανίαι <ὡς οὐκ?> ἀρχαῖοι· νεοί* and *νεκυώτατον· νεώτατον· προσφατώτατον*.

(29) Of the two conjectures *Φανόδημος* for *Φιλόδημος* and *Φερένικος* for *Φανόδημος* the latter is even more certain than the former, though the former is not doubtful either. About the context in which Ph. mentioned the Hyperboreans see on F 2. A digression on them is quite probable.

(30) The fraud is even more obvious here than in F 5: the Orestes story <sup>1</sup>) is impossible in the seventh book. About Orestes in Komana see Lesky *RE XVIII 1*, 1939, col. 1002.

### 326. MELANTHIOS

This *Atthis* is so little known that Lenz-Siebelis and C. Mueller altogether forgot the author in their collection of the Atthidographers. The book about Eleusis proves that he was an Athenian. We cannot determine his time more precisely than by stating that he published his *Atthis* certainly later than Kleidemos, the first Atthidographer <sup>1</sup>), and almost certainly earlier than Istros. If Krateros actually took the document concerning Diagoras <sup>2</sup>) from the special book on Eleusis (quite a credible supposition <sup>3</sup>)) we may date Melanthios roughly between 350



and 270 B.C. 4); he may have been the contemporary of Demon and Philochoros. The name which sounds aristocratic 5) would agree with this date: it is frequent in the fifth and fourth centuries, and seems to disappear subsequently 6); the last bearer of the name known to us is the father of the *πρύτανις* Diotimos of the deme Philaidai from c. 289 B.C. 7). Since we do not know anything about the life of the Atthidographer, or about his father or his deme, we cannot identify him 8); but the choregos who admired the simple ways of Phokion and whom we know from an anecdote only 9) would fit well as to the time and perhaps in other respects.

Besides an *Atthis* in at least two books a special work *Περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἐλευσίνι μυστηρίων* is attested for M. We must not, however, at that time infer from the title of the book that M. was a member of the aristocracy of Eleusinian priests, e.g. *ἐξηγητῆς ἐξ Εὐμολπιδῶν* 10). The citations from this book found in Athenaios and the Scholia on Aristophanes can be traced to early Hellenistic scholars 11). The only citation from the *Atthis* is found in Harpokration who took it from a grammarian of Augustan times, viz. Dionysios son (or disciple) of Tryphon, who like his master wrote a book *Περὶ ὀνομασιῶν* 12). The citation is sufficiently accurate for excluding any doubt of the existence of the book, but there is nothing to show whether Dionysios still used the *Atthis* directly, and whether some others of his Attic glosses come from it 13). Other attempts at enlarging the scanty remains of M. are equally hopeless 14). M.'s book seems to have attracted little, if any, attention outside the domain of scientific literature.

### F(RAGMENTS)

(1) Hesych. s.v. *γρυμπάνειν· γρυποῦσθαι· συγκάμπτειν; id.* s.v. *γρύπτειν· γρυποῦσθαι· συγκάμπτεσθαι*. There is no doubt about the meaning of the word 1) which may come from technical language, or from that of craftsmen. The citation has the form of a succinct annalistic entry, particularly so in the version of the Epitome which sometimes furnishes the better text. It is regrettable that there is no date to the entry: it is remarkably seldom that earthquakes are attested in Attica which suggests itself in the first place.

(2) The comic poet Antiphanes 1) also mentions these two fishes as being *Ἐκάτης βρώματα*. As Athenaios groups the mentions of them in literature in different sections 2) we cannot decide whether he found the citation of M. in Apollodoros *Περὶ θεῶν* 3) who is quoted immediately

before in the well arranged section about the τρίγλη, or whether he inserted it himself, taking it from one of his lexicographical sources <sup>4)</sup>.

As the fragment comes from the book about the Mysteries, we may suppose that M. explained why just these fishes were sacrificed to Hekate.

5 We know several explanations in regard to the τρίγλη <sup>5)</sup>, for the μαινίς the supposed connexion with μαινέσθαι may have been used <sup>6)</sup>.

(3) Schol. Aristoph. *Ran.* 320 <sup>1)</sup>: Διαγόρας μελῶν ποιητῆς ἄθεος [[δς και καινά δαιμόνια εισηγεῖτο, ὡπερ Σωκράτης]]. (και ὁ μὲν Ἀρίσταρχος Διαγόρου νῦν μνημονεύειν φησὶν οὐχ ὡς αἰδοντος αὐτοῦ τοὺς θεοὺς, ἀλλ' ἐν εἰρ-  
 10 νελαί κειμένου τοῦ λόγου ἀντὶ τοῦ χλευάζοντος, ἐξορχουμένου. [[ἀνακινεῖ οὖν τοὺς Ἀθηναίους. ὁ κωμικός]]) ὅθεν και οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ὡς διαχλευάζοντος τοὺς θεοὺς καταψηφισάμενοι ἀνεκέρησαν τῷ μὲν ἀναίρησοντι <sup>2)</sup> ἀργυρίου τάλαντον, τῷ δὲ ζῶντα κομίσαντι <sup>3)</sup> δύο <sup>4)</sup>. ἔπειθον δὲ και τοὺς τᾶλλους Πελοποννησί-  
 15 οὺς <sup>5)</sup>, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Κρατερός ἐν τῇ Συναγωγῇ τῶν ψηφισμάτων (342 F 16). ἦν δὲ οὗτος Τηλεκλύτου <sup>6)</sup> παῖς, Μήλιος τὸ γένος, τῶν αὐτοχρόνων Σιμωνίδη και Πινδάρῳ <sup>7)</sup>. (οἱ δὲ τὸ ΔΙΑΓΟΡΑΣ περισπῶσιν, ὡς Ἀπολλόδωρος <sup>8)</sup> ὁ Ταρσεύς, και φασιν Ἰακχον λέγειν, ὃν αἰδουσιν ἐξ ἄστεως διὰ τῆς ἀγορᾶς ἐξιόντες εἰς Ἐλευσίνα.) γέγονε δὲ και ἕτερος, κωμωιδούμενος ἐπὶ μεγέθει <sup>9)</sup>. Ἐρμιππος ἐν Μοίραις <sup>10)</sup> (I 235, 42 K) »μείζων γὰρ ἢ νῦν δὴ ἔστι, και δοκεῖ γέ μοι, /  
 20 ἔάν τοσοῦτον ἐπιδιδῶι δι' ἡμέρας / μείζων ἔσεσθαι <sup>11)</sup> Διαγόρου τοῦ Τερθρέως« <sup>12)</sup>. Diod. 13, 6, 7 (415/4 B.C., archon Charias) τούτων δὲ πραττομένων Διαγόρας ὁ κληθεὶς ἄθεος διαβολῆς τυχῶν ἐπ' ἄσεβείαι και φοβηθεὶς τὸν δῆμον ἔφυγεν ἐκ τῆς Ἀττικῆς. οἱ δ' Ἀθηναῖοι τῷ ἀνελόντι Διαγόραν ἀργυρίου τάλαντον ἐπεκέρησαν <sup>13)</sup>. Al-Mubaššir <sup>14)</sup>: *Leuciphus the sophist*  
 25 *was a disciple of Zenon the Wise. He, Heraclitus the Obscure, Empedocles, Melissus, Protagoras, Anaxagoras, Socrates, and Democrates* <sup>15)</sup> *lived at the same time as Zenon the Wise. In their time there lived Diagoras the Godless, and had his abode in the town of Attica. But when he persisted in godlessness, unbelief and blasphemy, the Sultân and the wise men and leaders*  
 30 *of Attica sought for him in order to kill him. And the Sultân—it was Charias the archon (415/4 B.C.)—set a price on his head and decreed that it should be proclaimed among the people: 'whosoever seizes Diagoras of Melos, his reward is a sum of money'. He heard this, went to the country Achaia to a town called Pellene, and took his abode there. Then a war broke out between*  
 35 *the inhabitants of Attica and the inhabitants of Laconia. It lasted for a long time, and by the war people were diverted from him. After that he remained for 54 years. After his death there was found upon him a book, written in the language of the inhabitants of Phrygia, full of blasphemies about the divine things.*

The peculiar phenomenon of the first real atheist and one of the few consistent atheists of all times, whom the Scholia on Aristophanes call *μελῶν ποιητῆς ἄθεος* and the Suda *φιλόσοφος καὶ ἄισματων ποιητῆς*, is in need of a completely new treatment. The life of Diagoras should be re-constructed from a tradition relatively rich in documents, biographical, and doxographic details. It would be possible to do this at least in the fundamental lines, and we should thus be enabled to understand his literary activity, and perhaps even to define his political attitude. I hope to do this in a special paper<sup>16</sup>). Here we restrict ourselves to the documentary fact attested by M. and Krateros, *viz.* the condemnation of Diagoras in Athens. The Scholia, being severely cut down, unfortunately give of the wording of the document merely the passage which coincides with the line of Aristophanes<sup>17</sup>), but we can form an idea of it from the Council's decree about Antiphon passed in 411/0 B.C., which was also engraved on a *στήλη χαλκῆ*, and which also contained the words of the *καταδίκη*<sup>18</sup>). From the paraphrase of the document it is clear that the charge was *ἀσεβείας* (as Diodoros correctly states), and that *ἀσέβεια* was found perhaps only, but certainly in the first place, in the attacks on the Eleusinian Mysteries occurring in the book which Diagoras had published under the title *Ἀποπυργίζοντες λόγοι*<sup>19</sup>). What remains doubtful is the time of the trial. The psephism was, of course, dated, but like that concerning Antiphon and like others of the time not by the name of the archon. Consequently an antiquary, writing more than half a century later, could establish a certain year only if the time of the trial could be inferred from the historical circumstances and from the report of them in the work of contemporary historians, as could be done in the case of Antiphon<sup>20</sup>). We cannot decide with certainty as to whether M. or Krateros attempted to ascertain a date: the former gave the decree not in the *Atthis* but in the book *Περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἐλευσίνι μυστηρίων*, and as to Krateros it is not quite certain whether he gave the psephisms in their chronological sequence. Biography therefore quite naturally thought of the offence of the Hermokopidai and of the simultaneous proceedings against Alkibiades and his friends because of their deriding the Eleusinian Mysteries. A number of death-sentences were pronounced in the course of these proceedings; some, who escaped the sentence by flight, were condemned *in absentia* and proscribed<sup>21</sup>). One thus arrived at the traditional year 415/4 B.C., given by the chronographer of Diodoros and by Porphyrios, and therefore certainly by Apollodoros in his *Χρονικά*. Consequently the date is not documentary but due to inference. The

inference may be correct, for Aristophanes *Av.* 1071 ff. (Elaphebolion 414 B.C.) mentions the proclamation against Diagoras in a manner which makes it appear possible, perhaps even probable, that the decree was quite recent<sup>23</sup>). What surprises us is the fact that the Scholia do not state the year  
 5 (as they do in analogous cases when they can consult an *Attis*) but are evidently uncertain about the year of the proclamation or of the trial: they do not connect these events with the offence of the Hermokopidai or that concerning the Mysteries, which agitated the Athenian people immediately before the Sicilian expedition in June 415 B.C.<sup>23</sup>), but with  
 10 the capture of Melos in winter 416/5 B.C. It therefore seems that the cited authorities M. and Krateros drew a different inference, if any<sup>24</sup>): the capture of Melos appeared to them to be a suitable occasion for carrying out the sentence on the Melian who had tried to discredit the Mysteries. The sentence was, however, not carried out, but a reward was offered for  
 15 the seizure of Diagoras, who therefore cannot have fallen into the hands of the Athenians when his native place was captured; and this is obviously the reason why the Scholia, with the words *μάλιστα ὑπὸ τὴν ἄλωσιν τῆς Μήλου*, cautiously add that this is merely a possible time, and with the words *οὐδὲν γὰρ κωλύει πρότερον* that the condemnation may have taken place earlier.  
 20 The question is whether they based these statements on indications, and if so what was the value of them. Now we find, in fact, that the comic poets concerned themselves with Diagoras as early as in the 'twenties, perhaps even in the year in which the Peloponnesian War broke out<sup>25</sup>). A testimony of Aristoxenos further makes it appear probable that in this  
 25 decade Diagoras was living not in Athens but in the Peloponnese<sup>26</sup>). Lastly, the Arab, notwithstanding the great confusion in his report, clearly and distinctly states that Diagoras left Athens already before the outbreak of the Great War, and that he went to live at Pellene<sup>27</sup>). That brings us to the period of religious trials which opened with the psephism  
 30 of Diopieithes<sup>28</sup>), and during which Anaxagoras among others was compelled to leave Athens. We cannot now make any further progress, e.g. we cannot ascertain whether regular proceedings against Diagoras were taken at that time, or whether he left Athens (as Anaxagoras probably did<sup>29</sup>)) in order to escape a formal accusation. Taking every-  
 35 thing into consideration, probability in my opinion favours the first alternative, though we cannot strictly prove it. But even if the book of Diagoras was published before 431 B.C., and if proceedings were opened in Athens at that time, the combinations made by Biography need not be quite wrong: it is possible that the matter was re-opened in connexion

with the offences of 415 B.C. regarding the Mysteries and with the attack on Alkibiades, and that the issue—if not a renewal (and intensification?) of the former sentence—was a regular condemnation. In any case, the fundamental date of Biography continues to be the result of 5 conjecture.

(4) The phrase θεοῦ τινος proves that a consecration to the deities of Eleusis was neither required nor customary: if this had been the case M. would surely have written τοῖν θεοῖν<sup>1)</sup>. The mystai consecrate the garments to any god, in most cases probably to one of their home place, 10 simply because the things are to be removed from daily use. This is also accomplished when (as according to the second version) ἐνοι τὰς τοιαύτας στολὰς εἰς τέκνων σπάργανα φυλάττουσιν, for of course they do this not because the garments καθαραὶ πάνυ ὑπάρχουσι καὶ νέαι, but in order to give the child a share in the blessings of the consecration<sup>2)</sup>. We cannot 15 decide whether M. mentioned this custom too; but the scholiast certainly did not take from him the trivial statement that there were great and small mysteries. The third version tells quite another story: ὁ δὲ μουόμενος τὸ ἱμάτιον ὃ ἐφόρει ἐν τῇ μύσει οὐδέποτε ἀπεδέυετο, μέχρις ἂν τελέως ἀφαισθῆι διαρρῦέν.

20

### 327. DEMON (OF ATHENS)

Biographical evidence is lacking, nor do we know much more about Demon's *Atthis*<sup>1)</sup> than we do about that of Melanthios. But its author, who also wrote *Περὶ θυσιῶν*<sup>2)</sup>, was certainly an Athenian<sup>3)</sup>, and the criticism of Philochoros in his *Atthis* and in a special treatise<sup>4)</sup> shows D. to have 25 been a contemporary of him. It is quite probable that he belonged to the family of Demosthenes, in which the names Δήμων, Δημομέλης, Δημοτέλης, Δημοσθένης, Δημοφῶν outnumber all others. The politician Δήμων Δημομέλους Παιανιεύς<sup>5)</sup>, a cousin of the orator Demosthenes<sup>6)</sup>, seems too early—nor do all the details concerning him suit the Athidographer, although 30 he was at some time priest of Asklepios<sup>7)</sup>—if he is the same whose extradition Alexander demanded in 335 B.C.<sup>8)</sup>, who in 324 B.C. accepted a bribe from Harpalos<sup>9)</sup>, in 323 B.C. proposed the re-call of Demosthenes<sup>10)</sup>, and who is usually supposed to be the speaker of the *Πρὸς Ζηνόθεμιν παραγραφή*<sup>11)</sup>. Possibly the Athidographer was son of 35 this Demon, and thus first cousin once removed of Demosthenes. As he does not appear in the inscriptions (if we do not identify him with the son of Demomeles) we may assume that he refrained from political ac-

tivity, his interests lying in other directions. Since he also wrote about proverbs<sup>13</sup>) it is doubtful whether we can infer from *Περὶ θεοσιῶν* an official connexion with sacred things. It is at least not impossible that, contrary to the tradition of his family, he entered the circle of Aristoteles and Theophrastos; and then it is at least conceivable, that his *Atthis*, too, was 'pro-Macedonian', though the polemical attitude against him taken by Philochoros in his *Atthis*, of course, furnishes no proof of this assumption. In any case, his literary character, if we compare him with Kleidemos and Phanodemos on the one side and with Androtion on the other, seems to have been that of an antiquary or a collector in the 'Peripatetic' manner. On his literary style see the remark of Rupprecht *R E XVIII* 4, 1949, col. 1740, 56 ff.

The extent of the *Atthis* must have been considerable, as Demon dealt with the post-Trojan kings in the fourth book<sup>13</sup>) (cf. *Atthis* p. 116). The few fragments preserved all belong to the period of the kings. It remains an open question whether this justifies the inference that Demon confined himself to that time<sup>14</sup>), or that he had to break off prematurely. The value of the work we are in no position to estimate. Neither is the polemic of Philochoros a proof that D.s work was 'non magna fide dignum'<sup>15</sup>), nor is the material sufficient for the opinion of Wilamowitz<sup>16</sup>) (who evidently did not distinguish between *Atthis* and *Paroimiai*) that his 'interest extended far beyond Athens and the book indulged largely in aitiological inventions' while 'the political bias was surprisingly less prominent'.

25

## F(RAGMENTS)

(1) This fragment provides some notion of D.s manner of narrating and of his plain but cultivated style. We learn that the *Atthis* knew sundry facts about these kings who are mere shadows to us: from the time of Apeidas Pausan. 7, 25, 1 reports a Dodonean oracle; Nikolaos of Damaskos 90 F 48 relates his assassination by Tymoithes apparently before his accession—things hardly later than the fourth century. About Melanthos, father of Kodros (F 22), who became the ancestor of the Medontids<sup>1</sup>), we do not know much beyond his origin from Messenia and his gaining the throne by a duel with the Boeotian king Xanth(i)os<sup>2</sup>), events which D. presumably also reported. From F 1 we learn that Melanthos settled first at Eleusis, and this is confirmed by *IG<sup>2</sup> II 1597* (fourth century B.C.): the 'Ἀπειδαντίδαι, whose epimeletes is Λεόντιος Καλλιᾶδου

'Ἐπικηφίσιος sell a χωρίον ἐγ Κοθωκιδῶν, and this deme is situated north of Thria <sup>3)</sup>). The cultic privilege the aition of which D. is giving cannot be determined more exactly, but it can hardly be connected with Dionysos Melanaigis <sup>4)</sup> or the Apaturia legend. Does τῶν ἱερείων really mean 'feminae sacerdotes' <sup>5)</sup>, is it not rather, on the analogy of ἀρχαί, 'the priests collectively'? In that case the festival would be some ἑορτὴ δημοτελής of the state of Eleusis. What amount of genuine tradition these accounts contained it is impossible to say.

(2) About the Tritopatores see on Phanodemos 325 F 6, who seems merely to have recorded facts concerning their cult, whereas D. and Philochoros are speculating about the nature of these deities. It will hardly do to dismiss D.s theory, of which we possess only the briefest possible outline, forthwith as a 'blunder' as Wilamowitz *Gl. d. Hell.* I p. 265 n. 4 does; on the contrary, it may come nearer to the ideas of the Athenians than the systematising doctrine of Philochoros. There may exist a relation to the θυρωροὶ καὶ φύλακες τῶν ἀνέμων Orph. F 318 K; but it is not at all certain that the view presented by Demon was 'Orphic'.

(3) A book Περὶ θυσιῶν was written also by Philochoros (328 F 80/2). The title seems more suggestive of antiquarian research than Kleidemus' <sup>20</sup> Ἐξηγητικόν, but this may be deceptive. Other, and mostly later, books of this *genre* see no. 359 ff. Presumably D.s work was contained in one book, and the only fragment refers to an Athenian, or it may be Eleusinian, cult: *I G<sup>2</sup> 1672, 279/80* (Eleusis 329/8 B.C.) κριθῶν μέδιμοι . . . ἀπὸ τούτων εἰς προκῶνια τοῖν θεοῖν . . . ; Pollux 6, 77 αἱ δὲ δανδαλίδες πεφυργμένων κριθῶν [καὶ πρόκωνα] καὶ προκῶνια τὰ ἐξ ἀφρύκτων κριθῶν ἄλφιτα; Hesych. s.v.; Erotian. *Voc. Hippocr. coll.* p. 57, 3 K1 ἄλφιτα προκῶνια· τὰ γινόμενα ἐκ τῶν ἀφρύκτων κριθῶν οὕτως Ἄττικοι καλοῦσιν. κάχρυς] Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1306 ὥσπερ καχρύων ὀνίδιον εὐωχημένον; κριθῶν Schol.; πεφυργμένας κριθάς Schol. *Nub.* 1358; αἱ λελεπισμένα κριθαί, ἀφ' ὧν ἡ <sup>25</sup> πτισάνη Schol. *Eq.* 254.

(4) It was Aristotle who turned attention upon proverbs. He found them to be παλαιᾶς φιλοσοφίας ἐν ταῖς μεγίσταις ἀνθρώπων φοροαῖς ἐγκαταλείμματα περισωθέντα διὰ συντομίαν καὶ δεξιότητα <sup>1)</sup>). The attack of the Isocratean Kephisodoros <sup>2)</sup> warrants the genuineness of Παροιμιῶν  $\bar{\alpha}$  in the <sup>35</sup> list of Aristotle's books, and Antiphanes' Παροιμίαι <sup>3)</sup> may have been inspired by the Peripatetic interest. Παροιμίαι  $\bar{\alpha}$  is found also in Theophrastos' literary remains <sup>4)</sup>; Klearchos wrote at least two books Περὶ παροιμιῶν, which are quoted rather frequently. Perhaps D. also wrote two, F 4 quoting a first book. It is incomprehensible that Crusius <sup>5)</sup> should have

defended the variant 'forty', and that it turns up again and again <sup>6</sup>). Even if we assume the broadest exegesis this number is impossible, since neither Didymos nor Lukillos of Tarrha filled more than 13 books each. Phot. s.v. οὐδ' Ἡρακλῆς was corrected to Δίκων ἐν β̄ τῆς δευτέρας συντά-  
 5 ξεως (690 F 2) a long time ago. As we have only one fragment with the number of a book nothing can be determined about the arrangement of D.s collection, but it is most improbable that the order was chronological <sup>7</sup>). Of the seventeen fragments only three refer to Attica <sup>8</sup>), so that the theory of Attic proverbs outnumbering others <sup>9</sup>) lacks foundation.  
 10 It is far more remarkable that barbarians are taken into consideration <sup>10</sup>); this may be due to the influence of Aristotle <sup>11</sup>) (not that of his Politics only), though we do not find other proof of it <sup>12</sup>). The explanations mostly draw upon myth and history <sup>13</sup>)—one of D.s historical sources being almost certainly Ephoros—, sometimes upon local facts or customs <sup>14</sup>),  
 15 less often upon facts of natural history <sup>15</sup>). Didymos used the book <sup>16</sup>), and although he often contradicts the explanations given by D. <sup>17</sup>) we may well assume that through him some of the material was carried on to later authors. But Schwartz is justly sceptical about adding to D.s store from Zenobios <sup>18</sup>), as has been recommended by Crusius <sup>19</sup>) and much  
 20 approved by some scholars <sup>20</sup>). Nor did W. Tschajkanovitsch <sup>21</sup>) remove the doubt. Reliable indications which would distinguish D.s proverbs from those of other paroemiographers are altogether lacking.

D.s explanation of Μουσῶν λεία is found also in Zenob. 5, 15 (Diogen. 6, 42; Mantissa Prov. 2, 28); a variant ἐπὶ πλάνηι (a mistake)—ἐπεὶ οἱ  
 25 Ἕλληνες ἐς Τροίαν πλέοντες πλανηθέντες τὴν Μουσίαν ἐπέβησαν ὡς Ἴλιον—  
*Lex. rhet.* p. 279, 15 Bkr; Mantissa 2, 28 connects with this proverb the Telephos story and a further proverb ὁ τρώσας ἰάσεται; both proverbs in Schol. Demosth. 18, 72. Of the several statements about the application of the proverb <sup>22</sup>), the least inappropriate being perhaps that of  
 30 Photios ἐπὶ τῶν καταφρονήτων καὶ εὐκαταφρονήτων, none tells us what is clear in Demosthenes and positively said by Aristotle <sup>23</sup>) that the point is the absence of resistance on the part of the attacked. This would not suit the erroneous attack of the Greeks on their way to Troy <sup>24</sup>), and possibly this is the reason why D. introduced the time of Telephos'   
 35 ἀποδημία, during which the people lacked their champion and protector. If so, the reference to the Greek attack must have been general at D.s time; he did not invent it but modified it deliberately. The essential question is whether we have to assume this general opinion for Aristotle and Demosthenes too, or whether their explanations are founded on a



conception of the Mysian people's character, like that developed later on by Poseidonios <sup>26</sup>) who describes them as being pious, vegetarian, and καθ' ἡσυχίαν ζῶντες—a description contradicted by the ἀγχεμάχαι II. N 5 (where Poseidonios wrote Μοισῶν): ἀπόρρητοι, καθὰ οἱ ἀγαθοὶ πολεμισταί.

(5) With Philochoros D. agrees in the rationalistic replacement of the Minotauros by Minos' general Tauros, who must not be inserted in the narrative of Kleidemos, according to which Deukalion, the successor of Minos, himself leads his δορυφόροι in the battle. But he disagrees with Philochoros and agrees with Kleidemos in reporting an attack of Theseus on Crete and a battle, which in his account is fought ἐν λιμένι, in that of Kleidemos ἐν πύλαις τοῦ Λαβυρίνθου. Obviously D. made the 'peculiar' and very bold narrative of Kleidemos the basis of his own, but he brought it nearer to the general tradition, which always connected Theseus and Minos.

(6) The report about the Oschophoria ch. 23, 2-4 is complete in itself. The only doubtful point is whether the variant ἢ μᾶλλον κτλ. § 4 belongs to it, for the variant is part of an explanation which knew that neither the Oschophoria nor the Eiresione <sup>1</sup>) had any connexion with Theseus originally. The quotation of D. occurs at the end of the account and therefore applies to the whole of it; but we cannot determine the origin of the far more important § 5, which has nothing to do with the Oschophoria legend. It is a detached note <sup>2</sup>) inserted by Plutarch here because he could find no other place for relating the establishment of the Theseus cult. The composition of chs. 22-24 is problematic also in other respects, but it seems obvious that ch. 23 consists of a series of appendices. Plutarch found them in his source, which was very circumstantial and abundant in variants about Theseus—it may have been Istros—and inserted them into his main account in his well-known and rather superficial manner. An analogy is provided by the note about the ship of Theseus ch. 23 § 1, the subject of which is also 'the Athenians' while Theseus, the subject in the main report <sup>3</sup>), is everywhere subordinated: ἐν ᾧ ἐπλευσε 23, 1; Θησέως καταστήσαντος 23, 2; Θησέως ἀποδόντος 23, 5. Similarly D.'s full description of the Oschophoria festival is nothing but a variant of the main account, which is differently designed and different as to the matter <sup>4</sup>). Its character as an appendix is obvious, for besides ch. 23, 1 about the ship of Theseus there is inserted between the two versions a section concerning the Apollo festival of the Eiresione <sup>5</sup>) which afterwards by καίτοι ταῦτ' ἄτινες κτλ. is taken again out of the overloaded

circle of Theseus. The main report ch. 22, 1-4 (death of Aigeus and the double character of the Oschophoria dependent on it) is obviously continued in ch. 24, 1 by the first action of the new king—the synoecism <sup>6</sup>).

<sup>7</sup>Ωσχοφορίων ἐορτή] About the Oschophoria see Mommsen *Feste* 5 p. 282 ff.; Preller-Robert *Gr. Myth.* I<sup>4</sup> p. 207 f.; Robert *Heldensage* p. 695 f.; Deubner *Att. Feste* p. 142 ff.; on Philochoros 328 F 14-16, whose description of the festival the epitomator of Harpokration unfortunately was too lazy to copy fully; the one sentence of Istros 334 F 8 is a poor compensation. The race, recorded by Aristodemos (Athen. II, 92 p. 495 F, possibly following Philochoros), will have to be kept entirely apart: D. does not know anything about it, and the grammarians have created confusion. In Proklos *Chrest.* (Phot. *Bibl.* 239 p. 322 a 13 ff.) the passages referring to it can easily be eliminated: ὠσχοφορικὰ δὲ μέλη παρ' Ἀθηναίους ἤιδετο· τοῦ χοροῦ δὲ δύο νεανίαι, κατὰ γυναῖκας ἐστολισμέ-

15 νοι, κλήμα ἀμπέλου κομίζοντες μεστὸν εὐθαλῶν βοτρυῶν (ἐκάλουν δὲ αὐτὸ ὠσ-  
 χην, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ τοῖς μέλεσιν ἢ ἐπωνυμία), τῆς ἐορτῆς καθηγούντο. ἀρξαι δὲ φασὶ  
 Θεσέα πρῶτον τοῦ ἔργου· ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἐκούσιος ὑποστάς τὸν εἰς Κρήτην πλοῦν  
 ἀπήλλαξε τὴν πατρίδα τῆς κατὰ τὸν δασμὸν συμφορᾶς, χαριστήρια ἀποδιδούς  
 Ἀθηναῖ καὶ Διονύσῳ, οἱ αὐτῶι κατὰ τὴν νῆσον τὴν Δίαν ἐπεφάνησαν, ἔπραττε

20 τοῦτο, δυσὶ νεανίαις ἐσκιατραφημένοις χρησάμενος πρὸς τὴν ἱερουργίαν ὑπη-  
 ρέταις. [[ἦν δὲ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ἢ παραπομπὴ ἐκ τοῦ Διονυσιακοῦ ἱεροῦ εἰς τὸ τῆς  
 Ἀθηναῶ τῆς Σκιράδος τέμενος]] εἶπετο δὲ τοῖς νεανίαις ὁ χορός, καὶ ἦιδε τὰ μέ-  
 λη<sup>7</sup>). [[ἔξ ἐκάστῃς δὲ φυλῆς ἔφηβοι <δύο?> διημιλλῶντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους δρόμῳι,  
 καὶ τούτων ὁ πρότερος ἐγεύετο ἐκ τῆς πενταπλ<6>γῃς λεγομένης φιάλης, ἢ συν-

25 ἐκινῶτο ἐλαίῳι καὶ οἴνῳι καὶ μέλιτι καὶ τυρῶι καὶ ἀλίτοις]]. D.'s description of  
 the procession may be supplemented as to some particulars from the  
 passage about the ὠσχοφορικὰ μέλη; but the difference between Διονύσῳι  
 καὶ Ἀριάδνῃ (D.) and Ἀθηναῖ καὶ Διονύσῳι (Proklos) must not be levelled  
 out as Meursius did, who in the text of Plutarch altered Ἀριάδνῃ to

30 Ἀθηναῖ, for Proklos gives the later tradition of the Ariadne story. We  
 cannot follow up that story here: D. certainly did not give the same  
 version as Kleidemos 323 F 17, but the Kerameikos is said to have its  
 name from a hero Keramos <sup>8</sup>), son of Dionysos and Ariadne <sup>9</sup>). Why  
 Theseus took two youths instead of maidens, D. does not seem to have

35 explained <sup>10</sup>); in my opinion it is the obvious consequence of the transfer  
 of the Oschophoria to Theseus, with whom the festival actually has  
 no connexion.

ἐξηιρέθη — φιλοξενίας] Regarding this detached note  
 two things are certain: (1) here, as throughout in ch. 23, 'the Athenians'  
 are the logical subject; this is proved by ἐξηιρέθη <sup>11</sup>). Thus the slight

alteration of *ἔταξεν* to *ἔταξαν* becomes necessary<sup>13</sup>). The part of Theseus is confined to the privilege accorded to the Phytalidai, and his grammatical subordination (*Θησέως ἀποδότος*) is better justified here than in ch. 23, 2, where, as the founder of the Oschophoria, he ought to have been the subject throughout. Also this emendation removes the main doubts of Toepffer *A. G.* p. 251 about the contents of this section: there exist parallels for a hero's establishing his own priest and cult.

(2) The passage concerns the cult of Theseus. The alteration of *αὐτῶι* (which naturally refers to Theseus) to *Αἰγεῖ*, accepted by Toepffer<sup>13</sup>), is impossible for Plutarch because of the context and because of the reference to ch. 12, 1<sup>14</sup>); it is also impossible materially because the Phytalids have nothing to do with Aigeus<sup>15</sup>). They are connected with Theseus, as is expressly related by Plutarch in ch. 12, 1: *προσιόντι δ' αὐτῶι (scil. Θησεῖ, after he had killed Periphetes, Sinis, Skiron, Kerkyon)*

*καὶ γενομένωι κατὰ τὸν Κηφισὸν ἄνδρες ἐκ τοῦ Φυταλιδῶν γένους ἀπαντήσαντες ἡσπάσαντο πρῶτοι, καὶ δεομένου καθαρθῆναι τοῖς νενομισμένοις ἀγρίσαντες καὶ μειλίχια θύσαντες εἰστίασαν οἴκοι, μηδενὸς πρότερον αὐτῶι φιλανθρώπου καθ' ὁδὸν ἐντυχόντος.* In the deme Lakiadai, which belongs to the municipal trittys of the Oineis and which is situated 'to the north-west of the Kerameikos on the sacred road to Eleusis<sup>16</sup>)', that family had a position similar to that of the Lykomids in Phlya: Pausan. 1, 37, 2 *προελθοῦσι δὲ ὀλίγον Λακίου τέμενός ἐστιν ἥρωος καὶ δῆμος ὃν Λακικάδας ὀνομάζουσιν ἀπὸ τούτου . . . ἔστι δὲ καὶ Ζεφύρου τε βωμὸς καὶ Δῆμητρος ἱερὸν καὶ τῆς παιδός· σὺν δὲ σφισιν Ἀθηναῖα καὶ Ποσειδῶν ἔχουσι τιμάς. ἐν τούτῳ τῶι χωρίῳ*

*Φύταλόν φασι οἴκωι Δῆμητρα δέξασθαι, καὶ τὴν θεὸν ἀντὶ τούτων δοῦναι οἱ τὸ φυτὸν τῆς συκῆς.* In this Poseidon Toepffer *l.c.* p. 252 ff. finds the Φυτάλιος or Φυτάλιμος of Troizen through whom 'the Troezenian heroes Aigeus and Theseus were brought in and have entered into close relations with the family of priests on the Kephisos', and Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* p. 271 n. 21 because of Plutarch. 23, 5 boldly asserts 'it is these ὄργεῶνες who, united for the purpose of the cult of Theseus, introduced the Troezenian hero into the city'. In Plutarch, however, at least the connexion of the Phytalids, established as priests by Theseus, with the *παρασχόντες τὸν δασμὸν οἴκοι*, who pay for the sacrifice, gives an impression of artificiality. Even if one grants the Phytalids an old cult of Theseus (though Pausanias does not mention it), and even if one admits that 'the names of the 14 children on the François vase may contain sound gentilician tradition', it does not justify Wilamowitz' assertion<sup>17</sup>) 'that is the legend of the temple', *viz.* of the Theseion 'in the market . . . in the middle of

the town... at the northwestern foot of the Akropolis below the old entry to the Akropolis' <sup>18</sup>). For the expedition to Crete and the Troezenian origin of Theseus are widely different things, nor is there any justification in taking for granted, as Wilamowitz and his followers <sup>19</sup>) do, that Plutarch has in mind the Theseion or at least 'the precinct which the founder of the city cannot very well have gone without'. Here the analysis, which proved the passage ch. 23, 5 to be a detached note, becomes important: Plutarch did *not* localize the τέμενος. I am quite ready to believe that he thought of the city, but I doubt that he was right. There were other Theseia, one of them being in the western suburb <sup>20</sup>). Philochoros in Plutarch. *Thes.* ch. 35, 3 acknowledges four <sup>21</sup>); Plutarch himself in ch. 36, 4 dates the establishment of Theseus' tomb ἐν μέσση τῆι πόλει with everything belonging to it at 476/5 B.C. That is the tradition as to the entire sacred precinct—Pausan. 1, 17, 6 ὁ μὲν δὲ Θησέως σηκὸς Ἀθηναίους ἐγένετο ὑστερον ἢ Μῆδοι Μαραθῶνι ἔσχον, Κίμωνος τοῦ Μιλτιάδου Σκυρίου ποιήσαντος ἀναστάτους κτλ.; Diod. 4, 62, 4 καὶ τέμενος ἄστυλον ἐποίησαν ἐν Ἀθήναις—which could not have been forgotten and which cannot be doubted. Nor do I find anything that would necessitate an earlier date. It seems extremely doubtful to me to prefer the Theseion to the Anakeion in the anecdote about Peisistratos <sup>22</sup>), for Pausan. 1, 18, 1 attests the antiquity of the latter in a passage immediately following the one quoted above about the late founding of the Theseion by Kimon. Now, Plutarch in ch. 36, when relating the establishment of the cult in the Theseion, makes the remarkable addition θυσίαν δὲ ποιοῦσιν αὐτῶι τὴν μεγίστην ὀγδόηι Πυραεψιώνος, ἐν ἣι μετὰ τῶν ἡθέων ἐκ Κρήτης ἐπανῆλθεν, and Lakiadai is the deme not only of the Phytalids but of Kimon as well. This might be the explanation of the artificial association of the Phytalids with the παρὰσχόντες τὸν δασμὸν οἴκοι (to whom the Phytalids did not belong) in the cult of Theseus in Athens: they came together when in 475 B.C. the cult was established, and Kimon's influence may be assumed. It is possible (not more than possible) that at that time the priesthood was actually given to the Phytalids on his proposal because they had an old cult of Theseus or some other claim to him <sup>23</sup>), and that at the same time all those families who claimed descent from one of the participants in the last δασμός were given a part in the cult. It is mere superstition that 'the participation of certain families' always 'implies antiquity'. What was created in 475 B.C. is an artificial construction. It made use of as many as possible of the different traditions, claims, and inventions about the hero, the importance of whom begins to increase in the 6th century B.C.

and does not attain its climax until the 5th. Perhaps Robert *l.c.* p. 753 comes nearest to the truth, when he writes: 'the first independent festival of Theseus' 'for which we have evidence was of more or less gentilitical character, and perhaps was not a festival of the State at all, 5 Kimon possibly having been the first to make it such when he built the famous Theseion'. But even he does not put clearly enough the point which seems essential to me.

(7) Zenob. *Prov.* 3, 87 (Suda s.v.) ἐς κόρακας· ἐν Θεσσαλίαι τόπος ἐστὶ Κόρακες (Κορακαὶ Skylax 65; see Staehlin *RE XI* 1370), ὅπου τοὺς κακούρ-  
 10 γους ἐνέβαλον, ὅθεν ἡ παροιμία· μέμνηται δὲ ταύτης Μένανδρος συνεχῶς. λέγουσι δὲ ὅτι Βοιωτοὶ Ἄρνην ποτὲ διοικοῦσι προεῖρητο (οἰκοῦσιν ἐρρήθη Sud) ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκπεσεῖσθαι τῆς χώρας λευκῶν κοράκων φανέντων. νεανίσκοι δὲ ποτε μεθυσθέντες καὶ συλλαβόντες κόρακας, γυψώσαντες ἀφήκταν πέτεσθαι·  
 15 ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ Βοιωτοὶ ἐταράχθησαν ὡς τῆς μαντείας λαβούσης τὸ τέλος· καὶ φοβηθέντες οἱ νεανίσκοι τὸν θόρυβον φυγόντες (ἐφυγον καὶ Sud) ὤκησάν τινα τόπον, ἐν ἐκάλεσαν Κόρακας. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἐκβαλόντες τοὺς Βοιωτοὺς οἱ Αἰολεῖς ἔσχον τὴν Ἄρνην οἰκίαν οὖσαν, καὶ τοὺς ἀμαρτάνοντας μεθιστᾶσιν εἰς τοὺς Κόρακας καλουμένους. Eust. *Od.* v 408 p. 1746, 62 Πάρ Κόρακος πέτρη] Ἰσως δὲ ἐκ τοιοῦτου τινὸς καὶ τὸ ἐν Κιλικίαι ὠνόμασται Κορακῆσιον· ἐξ αὐτοῦ δὲ  
 20 τὸ 'εἰς κόρακας', καθά φασιν οἱ παλαιοί, ὡς ἀπὸ τῶν οἰκούντων . . . . πονηρῶν ὡς εἰκὸς ὄντων. τινὲς μέντοι τὸ ἐς κόρακας ἀντὶ τοῦ εἰς κακὰ ὄρνεα ὁμοίον φασὶ τῷ 'εἰς αἶγας ἀγρίας'. Πausanias (F 183 Schw) δὲ φησιν ὅτι Βοιωτοῖς ἔχρησεν ὁ θεὸς ἔνθα λευκοὶ κόρακες αὐτοῖς ὀφθῶσιν, ἐκεῖ κατοικεῖν. ἰδόντες οὖν (φησί) κόρακας πετομένους <τοὺς τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἱεροῦς ἐν Θετταλίαι  
 25 add. Schol. Aristoph. *Nub.* 313; Phot. *Lex.* s.v. >περὶ τὸν Παγασιτικὸν κόλπον, οὓς ἄκακοι παῖδες ἐγύψωσαν <ὑπὸ μέθης>, ὤκησαν ἐκεῖ, καλέσαντες τὸ χωρίον Κόρακας. ὕστερον δὲ Αἰολεῖς ἐκβαλόντες αὐτοὺς ἐπεμπον ἐκεῖ τοὺς φυγαδευόμενους. ὁ δ' αὐτὸς λέγει καὶ ὅτι Ἀριστοτέλης (F 496 R) ἱστορεῖ λοιμοῦ κατασχόντος καὶ κοράκων πολλῶν γενομένων, τοὺς ἀνθρώπους θηρεύοντας αὐτοὺς καὶ  
 30 περικαθαίροντας ἐπαοιδᾶς ἀφιέναι ζῶντας καὶ ἐπιλέγειν τῷ λοιμῷ 'φεῦγ' ἐς κόρακας'. ὁ δὲ Αἰσώπος (*fab.* 101) πλάττει μυθικῶς κολοῖον μέγαν νομίσαντα τοῖς κόραξιν ἐξισοῦσθαι προσμῖζαι αὐτοῖς, ἠττηθέντα δὲ ὑποστρέψαι πάλιν εἰς τοὺς κολοιούς· τοὺς δὲ ἀγανακτήσαντας παίειν αὐτὸν καὶ βοᾶν 'φεῦγ' ἐς κόρακας'. Ἀριστείδης (IV) δὲ ἀποδίδωσι διὰ τὸ ἐν τραχέσι τόποις καὶ κρημνώδεσι τοὺς  
 35 κόρακας νεοσσοποιεῖσθαι λέγειν ἡμᾶς 'φεῦγ' ἐς κόρακας', ὃ ἐστὶν εἰς ἀποκρήμνους τόπους καὶ εἰς φθοράν. Et. M. p 127, 29 ἀποσκορακίζω . . . . τὸ καταλιμπάνω. λέγουσι γάρ τινες ὅτι ἐδόθη χρησμός τισι περικαθημένοις πόλει τοῦ λαβεῖν αὐτήν, ἵνα ἐὰν ἴδωσι λευκοὺς κόρακας ἐν τῇ πόλει ἦν ἐμελλον πορθῆσαι, μὴ πορθῆσαι αὐτήν ἀλλ' οἴκοι ὑποστρέψαι. λαβόντες δὲ οἱ ἐν τῇ πόλει  
 Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.)

κόρακας τοῦτο πυθόμενοι καὶ λευκάναντες αὐτοὺς μετὰ ἀσβέστου, ἀπέλυσαν ἔξω τῶν τειχῶν, οὓς θεασάμενοι οἱ ἑναντίοι ἀπόρθητον αὐτὴν κατέλειψαν, καὶ εἰς τοῦπίσω πλανηθέντες ὑπέστρεψαν. An essential difference between D. and Aristotle does not exist, both starting from a single fact,

5 a wrong way first abandoned by Aristeides. D.s explanation, strictly confined to a narrative of certain events occurring at a certain place, does not appear an advance on that of Aristotle, which works with actual religious customs and with parallels. But D.s account is not wholly an invention. His conception of the primeval history of Boiotia is that 10 of (Thukydides 1, 12, 3 and) Ephoros 70 F 119, in which the raven oracle <sup>1)</sup> may confidently be supplied from Hieronymos' survey of the μεταβολαὶ of Thebes <sup>2)</sup>. It is probable, even if it cannot be proved definitely, that D. borrowed his historical framework from Ephoros.

(8) Strabo 8, 6, 16 μιᾷ τῶν ἐκ τετραπόλεως τῆς περὶ Μαραθῶνα, καθ' ἧς 15 ἡ παροιμία 'Οινόνη (Οἰνὴ Cas) τὴν χαράδραν'; Zenob. 5, 29; Miller *Mé.* pp. 358; 376 (Sud. s.v. Οἰνὴ); Phot. Sud. s.v. Οἰναῖοι τὴν χαράδραν. The authors who used D. have not understood the meaning of κύκλους and have therefore altered it: ἐλυμήνατο αὐτῶν τὰ γεώργια καὶ τὰς οἰκίας κατέβαλεν Zen; πολλὰς τῶν οἰκιῶν ἀπώλεσαν Athous; διαφθεῖραι τὰς ἀμπέλους καὶ 20 τὰ δένδρα Coisl.; κατέκλυσε πάντα Phot. Sud. s.v. Οἰναῖοι. Conjectures like κοίλους or καρπούς <sup>1)</sup> and references to the Britons who built places of refuge περιφράξαντες δένδρεσι καταβεβλημένοις εὐρυχωρῇ κύκλον <sup>2)</sup> miss the sense required by κτημάτων πολλά. Because of the verb ἐγγῶσαι it cannot mean 'a circular wall' either, but (if it is right at all) only 'the 25 market-places of the villages' <sup>3)</sup>; cf. Harpokr. s.v. κύκλοι who quotes Deinarchos and Menander: οἱ τόποι ἐν οἷς ἐπωλοῦντό τινες; Hesych. s.v. καὶ ἐν ἀγοραῖ τόπος ἐνθα σκεύη καὶ σώματα πιπράσκονται; Pollux 7, 11 καὶ κύκλοι δὲ ἐν τῇ νέαι κωμωιδίαι καλοῦνται ἐν οἷς πιπράσκειται τὰ ἀνδράποδα, ἴσως καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ὄνια; *id.* 10, 18 with quotations from Alexis 30 and Diphilos; Schol. Aristoph. *Eq.* 137 ὁ δὲ κύκλος Ἀθηνησὶν ἐστὶ, καθάπερ μάκελλος ἐκ τῆς κατασκευῆς τὴν προσηγορίαν λαβόν· ἐνθα δὲ πιπράσκειται χωρὶς κρεῶν τὰ ἄλλα ὄνια, καὶ ἐξαιρέτως δὲ οἱ ἰχθύες; Aelian. *V. H.* 2, 1 τοῦ ἐν τοῖς κύκλοις κηρύττοντος <sup>4)</sup>. Accordingly it is not a 'term of little distinctness' <sup>5)</sup>, but one specifically Athenian, which 35 D. transferred (correctly perhaps) to the markets in the country-towns. In that case Wilamowitz' combination of the fragment with Aristoph. F 636 ὦμιην δ' ἔγωγε τὸν Κυκλοβόρον κατιέναι and *Eq.* 137 κερράκτης Κυκλοβόρου φωνὴν ἔχων <sup>6)</sup> (κυκλοβορεῖν *Ach.* 381), and his assertion that the name signifies the brook near Oinoe, may be correct. Even if this

was merely a 'passing nickname', it can have been bestowed only by the demes-men, which whose speech D. would show himself familiar when interpreting the name by κύκλους.

(9) Zenob. 1, 13; Diogen. 1, 6 'Αγαμέμνων γὰρ τὴν αὐτοῦ ἐβούλετο θυσιάσαι θυγατέρα, <ἣ δὲ ἔφυγεν add. Arsen. 14> · ἢ ἔτι βούν αὐτοῦ θύοντος ἔφυγε, καὶ μόλις κρατῆθεις εἰσῆχθη. The localisation ἐν Τροίαι is remarkable in face of Kleidemos 323 F 6 and Phanodemos 325 F 14; it is another point showing how incorrect it would be to write καὶ Δήμων in the former passage, or to attribute F 9 to the *Atthis*.

(10) Zenob. 4, 19; Athous 2, 56; Diogen. 5, 1; Hesych. s.v.; Suda s.v.; Crusius *Anal.* p. 154 f.; Gossen-Steier *RE* II A col. 432. Obviously Klearchos was the first to add the name of the author and to give a brief βίος of him.

(11) Zenob. 4, 24; Athous. 2, 16 ὁ Φάνιος, ὡς φασιν, ἐγένετο ὀβολοστά-  
 15 τῆς, ἄλλως δὲ τυφλός· ὑπανοίγοντος δὲ τοῦ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ τὰ ταμικεῖα καὶ τὴν θύραν, ἣν ἐκεῖνος ἰσχυρὰν ἐνόμιζεν εἶναι, <τὰ νομίσματα συλᾶν· διὰ τοῦτο οὖν Ath.<sup>ms</sup>; αὐτὸς οὐδὲν ἑώρα Diogen. 5, 5; οὕτως ἀπώλλυε τὰ φυλαττόμενα χρήματα· ἐντεῦθεν D V 2, 84> τὴν παροιμίαν εἰρησθαι ἐπὶ τῶν μηδὲν ἀνούτων ἐν τῷ φυλάττειν. Makarios 4, 60 ἐπὶ τῶν μεγαλοφώνων; Eust. *Od.* ω 304  
 20 τὰ μηδαμοῦ ὄντα χρήματα ἐπαροιμιάζετο στέγειν διὰ τὸ τὸν Φανίαν ψευδῶς ἐαντῷ κειμηλιούσθαι πλοῦτον. We have two different explanations, the first being concerned with the money, the second with the wife of the usurer. Whether D. mentioned the latter too remains doubtful, notwithstanding the indirect construction, since nothing else points to his  
 25 having given more derivations than one for the same proverb as later collectors do. The first explanation was current in two versions at least. That of Eustathios is immediately intelligible: the strong door locks up an empty cashbox. The other version is a variant of the story about the wife, but in Zenobios it has lost its conclusion which has not been cor-  
 30 rectly supplied by D V; after ἰσχυρὰν ἐνόμιζεν εἶναι a trick of the slave is expected. D. apparently gave a third version: the blind man replaces the sight he lacked by his hearing; Φάνου θύρα is simply a noisy door (creaking because it is not greased?).

(12) The first explanation has been developed from Aristoph. *Ran.*  
 35 159/160; see the scholia on the passage (Suda O 382); Diogen. 6, 98; Hesych s.v. Differently (somewhat like ὄνος λύρας?) Eust. *Il.* Z 252 τὸ εἰσάγειν ἀντὶ τοῦ εἰσεῖναι ἢ ὑπάγειν· φησὶ γὰρ 'Λαοδίκην ἐσάγουσα . . .'. χρήσιμον δ' ἐνταῦθα καὶ τὸ παρὰ τῷ κωμικῷ παροιμιῶδες ἐπὶ τῶν εἰς οὐδὲν ἄξιοι ἀχοφορούντων, τὸ 'ὄνος ἄγων μυστήρια'· καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖ ἄγειν οὐ τὸ

φέρειν ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀπιέναι, ἵνα ἦ ὄνος ἄγων μυστήρια ὁ ἀπιῶν εἰς τὴν τοῦ μυστηρίου ἑορτήν. Again D. derived his explanation from a specifically Eleusian custom; ὄνος = millstone: Hesych. s.v. ὁ ἀνώτερος λίθος τοῦ μύλου; Aelius Dionysios F 262 Schw. τοῦ μύλου τὸ κινούμενον; Phot. s.v. 'Αριστο-  
5 τέλης δὲ καθ' ἀμφοτέρων τάττει; Pollux 7, 19; 10, 112 ὄνος ἀλέτων.

(13) Diogen. 6, 87 ἐπὶ τῶν πανούργων (the explanation has dropped out); Makar. 8, 74. Strab. 6, 1, 15 'Αντίοχος (555 F 12) δὲ φησιν ἐκλειφθέντα τὸν τόπον (scil. Metapontion) ἐποικῆσαι τῶν 'Αχαιῶν τινὰς μεταπεμφθέντας ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν Συβάρει 'Αχαιῶν, μεταπεμφθῆναι δὲ κατὰ μῖσος τὸ πρὸς Ταραντίνους τῶν 'Αχαιῶν. . . . ἔστι δὲ τις καὶ οὗτος λόγος, ὡς ὁ πεμφθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν 'Αχαιῶν ἐπὶ τὸν συνοικισμόν Λευκιππος εἶη, χρησάμενος δὲ παρὰ τῶν Ταραντίνων τὸν τόπον εἰς ἡμέραν καὶ νύκτα μὴ ἀποδοίη, μεθ' ἡμέραν μὲν λέγων πρὸς τοὺς ἀπαιτοῦντας ὅτι καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐφεξῆς νύκτα αἰτήσαιο καὶ λάβοι, νύκτωρ δὲ ὅτι καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἐξῆς ἡμέραν. This λόγος is not from Ephoros who is  
10 quoted just before <sup>1</sup>), but perhaps from Aristotle's *Μεταποντίνων πολιτεία*. Dion. Hal. A. R. 19, 3 told the same anecdote about the Lacedaemonian Leukippos and the town of Kallipolis, ἐπίνοιόν τι τῶν Ταραντίνων.

(14) App. Προν. 3, 14 ἐπὶ τῶν σφόδρα πλουσίων. Strabo 6, 2, 4 (Ephoros?) τὰς δὲ Συρακούσας 'Αρχίας μὲν ἔκτισεν. . . . ἅμα δὲ Μύσκελλον τέ φασιν εἰς  
20 Δελφοὺς ἔλθειν καὶ τὸν 'Αρχίαν χρηστιαριζόμενον, ἐρέσθαι <δὲ> τὸν θεὸν πότερον αἰροῦνται πλοῦτον ἢ ὑγιειαν. τὸν μὲν οὖν 'Αρχίαν ἐλέσθαι τὸν πλοῦτον, Μύσκελλον δὲ τὴν ὑγιειαν· τῷ μὲν δὴ Συρακούσας δοῦναι κτίζειν, τῷ δὲ Κρότωνα καὶ δὴ συμβῆναι Κροτωνιάτας μὲν οὕτως ὑγιεινὴν οἰκῆσαι πόλιν. . . Συρακούσας δὲ ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἔκπεσεῖν πλοῦτον, ὥστε καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐν παροιμίαι διαδοθῆναι,  
25 λεγόντων πρὸς τοὺς ἄγαν πολυτελεῖς ὡς οὐκ ἂν τέχγένοιτο αὐτοῖς ἢ Συρακούσιων δεκάτη (ὅτι οὐδὲ τὴν τ. Συρ. δεκάτην ἀμείβω Epit.). The reference to Priene, apparently a mistake for Πριηνίη δίκη, is not from D.

(15) Zenob. 3, 6 γλαῦξ εἰς 'Αθήνας· ἐπὶ τῶν ἀχρήστους ἐμπορίας ἀγόντων, ἐπειδὴ τὸ ζῶιον πάνυ ἐπιχωριάζει τοῖς 'Αθηναίοις; Athous 2, 12;  
30 Suda s.v. γλαῦκα εἰς 'Αθήνας; Hesych. s.v. γλαῦκ' 'Αθήναζε; Eust. II. A 206 P. 87, 34 ἐμφαίνει μὲν καθ' ἱστορίαν καὶ αὐτὴ φίλον εἶναι πτηνὸν 'Αθηναῖ τὴν γλαῦκα, λαμβάνεται δὲ ἢ ἐπὶ τῶν συμβαλλόντων ἔνθα μὴ χρεῖα συμβολῆς, ἢ ἐπὶ τῶν θαμιζόντων ἔνθα πολὺ τοιοῦτον πλῆθος κτλ.; Gregor. Cyrp. 2, 11 ἐπὶ τῶν ἐπιδεικνυμένων πρὸς τοὺς εἰδότας ἄπερ ἄμεινον αὐτοῦ Ἰσασιν. Whether  
35 Philochoros 328 F 200, who is speaking about the stamp of the tetradrachm, explained the proverb, we do not know. The rejection of D.s further explanation may derive from Didymos (Crusius *Anal.* p. 136).

(16) Zenob. 5, 80 (Athous 1, 45) φασὶ τοὺς Κἄρας πολεμουμένους ὑπὸ Δαρείου τοῦ Πέρσου κατὰ τινὰ παλαιὰν μαντείαν εἰρημένην αὐτοῖς τοὺς



ἄλκιμωτάτους προσθέσθαι συμμάχους ἐλθεῖν εἰς Βραγχίδας, καὶ τὸν ἐκεῖ θεὸν  
 ἐρωτῆσαι εἰ Μιλησίους πρόσθουτο συμμάχους, τὸν δὲ ἀποκρίνασθαι 'πάλαι  
 ποτ' ἦσαν ἄλκιμοι Μιλήσιοι'. οὗτος δὲ ὁ στίχος εἴρηται τὸ πρότερον παρὰ  
 'Ανακρέοντι (F 86 D), ὃς ἤκμασε μάλιστα κατὰ Κύρον τὸν Πέρσην· τρίτος  
 5 δὲ ἐστὶν ἀπὸ Κύρου Δαρεῖος. In Makarios 7, 3 and Suda s.v. the explanation  
 has dropped out; Apostol. 13, 85 mixed up several explanations. Of the  
 four variants of the scholion b (containing the quotation from D.), c, d <sup>1</sup>)  
 belong together and most probably refer to the Ionian revolt <sup>2</sup>). The first  
 (a) mentions instead a war of Polykrates πρὸς τινὰς (obviously because of  
 10 Anakreon <sup>3</sup>)), in which he thought of an alliance with the Milesians, but  
 is warned by the god. A decline of the Milesian power after they had  
 lost their independence through Cyrus is very possible, and one might  
 ask whether the mysterious oracle which Herodt. 6, 18/9 connected with  
 the Μιλήτου ἄλωσις in 494 B.C. referred in fact to the menace by Cyrus  
 15 and actually influenced the policy of Miletos (Herodt. 1, 141, 4; 169).  
 Without a historically determined reference <sup>4</sup>) Aristotle <sup>5</sup>) seems to  
 have mentioned the τρυφή of the Milesians as the reason of their down-  
 fall (κατερρῦη τὸ τῆς πόλεως ἀνδρείον), and so did Klearchos ἐν δ Βίων <sup>6</sup>),  
 while Herakleides of Pontos ἐν β Περὶ δικαιοσύνης <sup>7</sup>) regards intestine  
 20 struggles as the consequence of their τρυφή, mentioning a menacing  
 oracle but not the proverb. The source of D. is neither Aristotle nor  
 Herodotos, but perhaps it is Ephoros 70 F 183, who may easily have  
 supplied a cause for the historical fact by a moralizing rebuke: Diod.  
 10, 25 ὅτι Κᾶρες ὑπὸ Περσῶν καταπονούμενοι ἐπηρώτησαν περὶ συμμαχίας εἰ  
 25 προσλάβουσι Μιλησίους συμμάχους, ὃ δὲ ἀνεῖλεν 'πάλαι ποτ' ἦσαν ἄλκιμοι Μι-  
 λήσιοι'· οὐ μὴν ἄλλ' ὁ φόβος ἐγγὺς κείμενος ἐποίησεν αὐτοὺς ἐπιλαθέσθαι τῆς  
 πρὸς ἀλλήλους φιλοτιμίας, πρὸς δὲ τὸ πληροῦν τὰς τριήρεις κατὰ τάχους  
 συνηνάγκαζεν. Analogies to, and differences from, Herodt. 5, 118/121,  
 who merely relates the final act, are obvious: Herodotos even reports  
 30 two deliberations, but in different situations and accordingly with  
 different orders of the day, though in 5, 120 the arrival of help from the  
 Milesians decides for the continuation of the combat. The attempt  
 to emend the corrupt 'Αμπρακιώτας from Herodt. 5, 119, 2 <sup>8</sup>) is wrong;  
 we expect the name of a people, but I cannot find what it was <sup>9</sup>): the motif  
 35 in which the story is embedded in order to explain why the Karians rose  
 derives from Herodt. 1, 53; but the alternative Μιλησίους προσκαλεῖν οἱ  
 διαλύσασθαι πρὸς τοὺς Πέρσας shows that it cannot have been the Per-  
 sians <sup>10</sup>). The reference to the Median party in Miletos and their agree-  
 ment with the Branchidai who gave the unfavourable oracle <sup>11</sup>) is evidence

that D. used a historical report more circumstantial than that of Herodotos.

(17) Phot. Sud. s.v. ἔσχατος Μυσῶν. "Ἐλλησι λοιμῶι κρατουμένοις ὁ θεὸς ἔχρησεν ἐπὶ τὸν ἔσχατον Μυσῶν πλεῖν· οἱ δὲ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἠπτόρουν, αὖθις δὲ τὴν Αἰολίδα παρὰ τοῖς ἔσχατοῖς τῆς Μυσίας εὗρον. ἔνιοι τὴν παροι-  
 5 μίαν ἕκ τινος χρησμοῦ λέγουσι Τελέφωι μαντευομένωι γεγονέναι περὶ γονέων, ἐπὶ τίνας τόπους ἔλθων εὗροι τοὺς γονεῖς· τὸν δὲ θεὸν προστάξαι πλεῖν ἐπὶ τὸν ἔσχατον Μυσῶν· ἀφικόμενον δὲ εἰς Τευθρανίαν (νεμέσθαι γὰρ ταῦτα τὰ χωρία Μυσοῦς) ἐπιτυχεῖν τῆι μητρὶ αὐτοῦ. τάττεται ἡ παροιμία ἐπὶ τῶν δυσχερῆ ἐπιτασσομένων. The first explanation was given also by Hesych.  
 10 s.v. and Diogen. (V) 2, 47, the second (τάττεται ἐπὶ τῶν ὑπερηφάνως τισὶ κεχρημένων), invented perhaps in order to answer criticism directed against Euripides <sup>1)</sup>, by Zenobios <sup>2)</sup>. A third explanation (ἐπὶ τῶν εὐτελεστάτων), reminding us of the manner of Aristides <sup>3)</sup>, is found in the scholia on Plat. *Theat.* 209 B with evidence from Magnes and Menander <sup>4)</sup>);  
 15 it is known also to Cicero *Pro Flacco* 65 and Plutarch. *De Herod. mal.* 39 in the form ἔσχατος Καρῶν. Nothing points to D.s having mentioned the second explanation, or to Didymos having set it against that of D. with controversial intent. But obviously D. started here too from Ephoros' account of the Aeolian migration according to which it is the great-  
 20 grandson of Orestes, Gras, who after διατριβαὶ καὶ χρόνοι μακρότεροι reaches Lesbos and the Troas <sup>5)</sup>, and he motivated the delay by the oracle's being difficult to fulfil. Ephoros is not, however, D.s only source; for the narrative of the latter (κατὰ τὴν ἐχομένην γενεάν) makes use of the two pedigrees issuing from Orestes: Orestes ~ Hermione—  
 25 Tisamenos—Kometes, and Orestes ~ Erigone—Penthilos—Echelas—Gras. That there existed several combinations and detailed accounts is shown by Pausanias 7, 6, 2.

(18) Zenob. 5, 85 (Hesych. s.v.) Σαρδόνιος γέλως· Αἰσχύλος ἐν τοῖς Περὶ παροιμιῶν (IV) περὶ τούτου φησὶν οὕτως (Αἰσχύλος — οὕτως om Hes)· 'οἱ  
 30 τὴν Σαρδῶ κατοικοῦντες, Καρχηδονίαν ἔντες ἀποικοῖ, τοὺς ὑπὲρ τὰ ὄρη γεγονότας τῶι Κρόνωι ἔθουον\* \* (Jac) γελῶντες (γελῶντα Hes) καὶ ἀσπαζόμενοι ἀλλήλους· αἰσχρὸν γὰρ ἡγοῦντο δακρύειν καὶ θρηνεῖν'. τὸν οὖν προσποιητὸν γέλωτα Σαρδόνιον κεκλήσθαι. The tradition is abundant, and the explanations vary. As the facts do not yet seem to have been set  
 35 forth clearly, and as the relations of the several explanations seem not to have been perceived correctly, a short exposition is necessary. I begin with a scheduled survey:

I. Phot.; Sud.	1) Demon	2) Timaios (566 F 64)	3) ἄλλοι καὶ Κλειτάρχος (137 F 9)	4) Simoni- des (202A Bgk)	5) Silenos (175 F 5)	6) ἔνιοι (Homer)
II. Schol. 5 Od.	1) φασί (=Simon.)	2) ἔνιοι (=Silen.; Lukillos)	3) Timaios	4) ἄλλοι ἄλ- λως	5) Demon	
III. Zenob. 5, 85	1) Aischy- los (dub. 455 N <sup>2</sup> )	2) Timaios	3) τινές (Sil.; Luk.)	4) ἄλλοι	5) Simoni- des	
10 IV. Athous 1, 68	1) λέγουσι (Sil.; Luk.)	2) Philo- xenos				
V. Hesych. s.v.	1) <=De- mon >	2) τινές (Sil.; Luk.)	3) ἄλλοι (=Simon.?)			
15 VI. Schol. Plat. Resp. 337A	1) Timaios	2) Kleitar- chos	3) Simoni- des; So- phokles (163 N <sup>2</sup> )	4) Lukillos (=Silen.)		

We follow up the survey with the data with which the interpreters work. Three of them are ethnographical and one is etymological: (1) the custom of the Sardinians to kill τούς γεγηρακότας τῶν γονέων (τοὺς ὑπὲρ ὁ ἔτη II, III); the old people die laughing: Timaios (Demon, Aischylos).

(2) λάχανον παρά Σαρδονίοις ἡδύ, σελίνωι ἐμπερές, οὐ τοὺς γευσαμένους τάς τε σιαγόνας <σεσηρέναι> καὶ τὰς σάρκας αὐτῶν ἀποδάκνειν (οἱ γευσάμενοι δοκοῦσι μὲν γελῶντες, σπασμῶι δ' ἀποθνήσκουσι): Silenos; Lukillos of Tarrha (ἤκουσα ἐγχωρίων λεγόντων).

(3) The Phoenician-Carthaginian sacrifice of children to Kronos, where συνέλκεσθαι τε τὰ μέλη, καὶ τὸ στόμα σεσηρός φαίνεσθαι τοῖς γελῶσιν παραπλησίως: Kleitarchos.

(4) The etymology which derives σαρδάνιος from σαιρεῖν<sup>1</sup>) and to which our earliest author<sup>2</sup>) gives a mythological foundation: the iron giant Talos, created by Hephaistos for Minos as a guardian of Crete, kills τούς πελάζοντας κατακαίω, ὄθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ σεσηρέναι διὰ τὴν φλόγα τὸν σαρδάνιον λεχθῆναι γέλωτα: Simonides, Sophokles.

It follows at once: (a) that the etymology σαρδάνιος from σεσηρέναι occurs also in no. 3, not however in no. 1, where the laughter is 'Sardinian'. No. 2, where I have supplied σεσηρέναι, in this respect belongs to the contaminating versions and possibly by this very fact is proved to be wholly an invention. Correspondingly the laughter, common to both versions, is actual laughter in no. 1, in nos. 2-4 apparent only; it is explained

as being either προσποιητός or σεσηρῶς γέλως. (b) that of the two readings σαρδάνιος (correctly spelt with a small σ in Liddell-Scott) and Σαρδόνιος the first is the original form, and the second began to compete with it only when Timaios supplied the Sardinian custom, and Silenos the Sardinian plant<sup>3)</sup>; after that it makes headway more and more decisively. In the text of Plato the best evidence is for σαρδάνιον<sup>4)</sup>, as well as in Pausan. 10, 17, 13, although he follows the explanation of Silenos, as does Lukillos who consequently adds οὕτω δὲ Σαρδόνιος ἂν λέγοιτο καὶ οὐ σαρδάνιος. In the text of the Odyssey, however, Σαρδόνιον<sup>5)</sup> entirely prevails, and in the lexicographers and paroemiographers (Hesychios and Zenobios) the vestiges of the correct reading, or in some cases of the very existence of the problem, if found at all, are confused<sup>6)</sup>. That this was different originally, and that the problem was discussed, is shown, apart from Lukillos, by Eust. *Od.* v 302 p. 255, 5 Schwabe:

15 τὸ δὲ σαρδάνιον, ὃ τινες Σαρδόνιον γράφουσιν, ἐξ οὗ καὶ 'δισαρδόνη-  
 σεν' ἐν 'Ρητορικῶι λεξικῶι' τὸ διεγέλασεν οὐκ ἐπὶ διαχύσει, δηλοῖ μὲν τὸ  
 ἄκριος χεῖλεσι σεσηρῆναι τὸν ἔσω δακνόμενον θυμῶι ἢ λύπηι, ἵνα ᾖ σαρδά-  
 νιον 'Ὀμηρικῶς καὶ Σαρδόνιον δὲ κατὰ τοὺς ἄλλους τὸ σεσηρὸς καὶ σαρκαστι-  
 κόν.

(c) that not only in the spelling but in the explanation as  
 20 well the Sardinian custom exhibited by Timaios made an impression and  
 caused the facts to be obscured by levellings and by inventions: the Sar-  
 dinian plant mentioned by Silenos seems to be such an invention. But  
 apparently D. and certainly Aischylos begin to make the Sardinians  
 Καρχηδονίων ἄποικοι and mention the sacrifices to Kronos, although this  
 25 is proved to be incorrect by the accurate description of Timaios. Sub-  
 sequently Philoxenos, or rather his sources (φησὶν ἐνίους ἱστορεῖν Athous),  
 transferred the Phoenician sacrifice of children, also most accurately  
 described by Kleitarchos, together with the ξόανον τοῦ Κρόνου προτεῖνον  
 τὰς χεῖρας, to 'the isle of Sardinia'. Even the Talos story, clearly at home  
 30 in Crete, does not escape the levelling, in as much as Sardinia is made the  
 earlier abode of the monster.<sup>7)</sup>

D. offers a special problem, first in that Zenobios reports nearly the  
 same version as given by Αἰσχύλος ἐν τῶι Περὶ παροιμιῶν. The conjecture  
 of Crusius *Anal.* p. 148 n. 1; *RE I* col. 1084 no. 14 <μέμνηται ταύτης> Αἰσχύ-  
 35 λος ἐν τοῖς <Αἰγυπτίσις (ο. Φρυξί), Δήμων δὲ ἐν τοῖς> Περὶ παροιμιῶν is rather  
 wild and, moreover, in view of the μέμνηται ταύτης Ὀμηρος καὶ Πλάτων  
 of the Athous, improbable. Actually the poet Aischylos would not be  
 more impossible than Simonides or Sophokles, but we do know about a  
 presumably late Alexandrian Aischylos, an ἀνὴρ εὐπαίδευτος who was

the author of *Messenika* and of tragedies <sup>7</sup>). It is this man whom Meursius, Schneidewin and others had in mind, and the fact that this Aischylos is among the levellers, who make Sardinia a colony of Carthago, certainly does not tell in favour of his being the old poet. In the second place we have the explanation of D. merely in a *ιστορία* which does not guarantee that the whole story belongs to the author quoted. In this story, in comparison with that told by the Aischylos of Zenobios, there is a surplus, *viz.* the sacrifice also of *αίχμαλώτων οἱ κάλλιστοι* which does not at all fit in with the *πρεσβύτεροι οἱ ὑπὲρ ὅ ἔτη γεγεννημένοι*, and which, moreover, is unique in the explanations of the proverb. Did D.—we know that he took the West into account (F 13)—report sacrifices of prisoners by the Sardinians, and did the *ιστορία* fuse into one the two Sardinian reports, that of D. and that of Timaios and Aischylos? We cannot restore his account in its details: it is conceivable that the prisoners laugh *ἐνεκα τοῦ ἑπανδρον φανῆναι*; and the traces in Zenobios and Hesychios seeming to show that it was not the sacrifices but the sacrificers who were laughing may be misleading. At any rate the facts are too complicated for us to content ourselves with the suggestion of Pohlenz <sup>8</sup>), that D. 'combined' the custom of the Carthaginians (which concerned children, not prisoners of war <sup>9</sup>)) and the version of Timaios, even if we could assume that the first books of the latter were already available to him.

(19) Schol. Plat. *Euthyd.* 292 E; Schol. RV Aristoph. *Ran.* 439 (four versions); Zenobios <sup>1</sup>); Suda s.v. The explanation in the scholia on Pindar *Nem.* 7, 155a (Hesych. s.v.) refers to the proverb *δέχεται καὶ βῶλον Ἀλήτης*. D.'s explanation *ἐπὶ τῶν ἀγαν μὲν ὑπερσεμνομένων, κακῶς δὲ ἀπαλλαττόντων*, which takes the whole story into account, is also found in Schol. Plat. and as a variant (*ἄλλοι*) in Athous 1, 68. Usually the explanations *ἐπὶ τῶν τὰ αὐτὰ λεγόντων* <sup>2</sup>) and *ἐπ' οὐδενὶ τέλει ἀπειλούντων* <sup>3</sup>) are derived from the concluding words of Pindar. *Nem.* 7 *ταῦτά δὲ τρίς τετράκι τ' ἀμπολεῖν ἀπορία τελέθει, τέκνοισι ἄτε μαψυλάκας Ἰδὸς Κόρινθος*, according as one starts from *ταῦτά δὲ κτλ.* or from *μαψυλάκας*.

If D. did, in fact, call the Megarians plainly *Κορινθίων ἀποικοι* <sup>4</sup>) he (or the epitomist) has simplified the representation of Ephoros <sup>5</sup>). But what he is concerned with is merely the supremacy of Corinth which he depicts—unhistorically, no doubt—according to the relation of the Spartans to their Messenian helots. *ἀν στενάξειεν*] appears to be a recollection of Homer and Herodotos transcribed into Attic prose <sup>6</sup>); *οὐκ ἀνέξεται ὑμῶν ὁ Διὸς Κόρινθος* say Schol. Aristoph. a; Zen.; Sud. <sup>7</sup>). Instead of *παροξυνθέντες* Schol. Aristoph. a have the sound

Attic term *συκχανθέντες*. At the end the formal *ἔτι καὶ νῦν* is to be noted.

(20) Zenob. (C) 6, 5; Eustath. *Od.* ξ 327 (= Pausan. Att. F. 139 Schw). Zenob. 6, 5 (P; BV; Ath. 1, 2; in Diogen. 8, 32 and Greg. Cypr. M 2, 81 the explanation has dropped out). The former only renders the version of Polemon, and so does Strab. 7 fr. 3, who knows the *χαλκίον* to be *ἀνάθημα Κερκυραίων* and *Κερκυραίων μάστιξ* as another form of the proverb. Whether the *Dodonaesque lebetas* of Virgil (*A* 3, 466) refer to the version of D. is very questionable: the Scholia give no explanation, but the passage suggests that the multitude of the tripods was a characteristic feature of Dodona. The main reason why Didymos prefers Polemon, *viz.* his autopsy, seems to be sound; less so the linguistic objection, since *χαλκίον* can be used as a collective noun, and in fact is used thus by Menander I 22, 66 K. We do not know whether D. too was acquainted with the locality, but a *ναὸς τοίχους μὴ ἔχων* is so extraordinary that one can hardly believe it to be an invention. It actually means that there was no temple in the Greek sense of the word in Dodona, and this seems to be confirmed by the report of Polyb. 4, 67. Moreover, Menander's *τὸ Δωδωναῖον ἄν τις χαλκίον δ λέγουσιν ἡχεῖν, ἦν παράψηθ' ὁ παριῶν κτλ.* presupposes D.'s description. Again and again one returns to the hypothesis of Welcker that D. and Polemon are speaking of different things, though not in the sense that 'circularis lebetum apparatus Polemonis aetate collapsus fuit et alter minus artificiosus in locum eius successit'; but Polybios reports that Dodona was looted in 219 B.C. by the Aetolians and that their general Dorimachos *τάς τε στοάς ἐνέπρησε καὶ πολλὰ τῶν ἀναθημάτων* 25 *διέφθειρε, κατέσκαψε δὲ καὶ τὴν ἱερὰν οἰκίαν*. Polemon saw only the votive gift of the Kerkyraeans, which had escaped destruction. Its age is not known to us <sup>1)</sup>, but the idea certainly was to vary the miracle of sound in a particularly Kerkyraean way. According to D. the wonder seems to consist in the fact that the sound produced by a touch of one tripod <sup>2)</sup> travels through the whole row of tripods 'until it (the subject is *ἡ ἐπήχησις*, ὁ ἦχος) reaches the first tripod <again>', or (the slightly corrupt text of Stephanos can hardly mean anything else) that it lasts so long 'until the producer (*τὸν ἐνὸς ἀπτόμενον*) makes it stop by <once more> touching the first tripod'. Neither the text of the Suda *ἡχεῖν ἐκ διαδοχῆς πάντας κτλ.* nor that of Philostratos quoted below allows of deciding this alternative because the latter describes the Kerkyraean anathema, nor do the poetically vague terms of Menander and Kallimachos. That 'in the fourth century prophecies were made out of the ringing of the copper basins' <sup>3)</sup> would not be impossible in the case of the circle of tripods.

For the Kerkyraean votive gift this appears less probable <sup>4)</sup> because it only sounds accidentally, when the wind moves the strings of the whip <sup>5)</sup>.

The remarkable fact here is the duration of the sound: ἀδιαλείπτως Steph; ἐπὶ πολὺν χρόνον Lukillos; Zen. (P ἤχος μέγας BV); ἐς πολὺ τῆς ἡμέρας 5 καὶ μέχρι λάβοιτό τις αὐτῆς μὴ σιωπῶν Philostrat. *Imag.* 2, 33; μακροῦς ἤχους ἕως ὁ μετρῶν τὸν χρόνον ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ ἤχου μέχρι τέλους καὶ ἐπὶ τετρακόσια προέλθοι Strab. *l.c.*

(21) Aristot. *H. A.* 9, 5 p. 611 a 25 (Aelian. *N. A.* 6, 5; Plin. *N. H.* 8, 115) ἀποβάλλουσι δὲ καὶ τὰ κέρατα ἐν τόποις γαλεποῖς καὶ δυσεξευρέτοις, 10 ὅθεν καὶ ἡ παροιμία γέγονεν 'οὐ (ἴθι οὐ Lat ?) αἱ ἔλαφοι τὰ κέρατα ἀποβάλλουσιν' ὥσπερ γὰρ τὰ ὄπλα ἀποβεβληκυῖαι φυλάττονται ὀραῖσθαι. λέγεται δ' ὡς τὸ ἀριστερὸν κέρας οὐδεὶς πω ἐώρακεν· ἀποκρύπτειν γὰρ αὐτὸ ὡς ἔχον τινὰ φαρμακείαν <sup>1)</sup>. For the explanation see Makarios 6, 44 ἐπὶ τῶν πανωλεθρίαι διαφθειρομένων; cf. also Plutarch. *De Pyth. or.* 19 p. 403 D ἀνεῖλεν οὖν ὁ θεὸς διδόναι 15 Προκλεῖ <sup>2)</sup> φυγὴν καὶ μετὰστασιν, ὅπου τὸν φορμὸν ἐκέλευσε καταθέσθαι τὸν Αἰγινήτην ξένον, ἢ ὅπου τὸ κέρας ἀποβάλλει ὁ ἔλαφος. συνεῖς οὖν ὁ τύραννος ὅτι κελεύει καταποντίζειν ἑαυτὸν ἢ κατορύττειν ὁ θεός — οἱ γὰρ ἔλαφοι κατορύττουσι καὶ ἀφανίζουσι κατὰ [τῆς] γῆς ὅταν ἐκπέσῃ τὸ κέρας κτλ.

(22) The Suda has two versions. The first (a) derives from the source 20 common to it and Photios, *viz.* the Σ(υναγωγὴ); the second (b) is introduced by οἱ δὲ and the full citation οἱ δὲ ῥήτορες τὸ 'Κόδρος' ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐντίμου ἐχρήσαντο, ὡς φησιν Εὐδήμος ἐν τῷ Περὶ λέξεων ῥητορικῶν <sup>1)</sup>. The probability that Photios in writing Δῆμων (in whose *Atthis* the story of Kodros must have been given in the fourth book not very far from 25 F 1) is correct, and that the Suda's Εὐδήμος has crept in from version b would be great but for the form Νεῦλω, which appears doubtful for D. <sup>2)</sup> in spite of Herodian. II 450, 26 L, and which one cannot simply alter to the Νηλέως of the Suda, as Naber does. The two versions differ only in one point, unessential for the proverb, *viz.* the motive of the Dorian 30 attack: in (a) it is the reception of the φυγάδες, particularly that of Melanthos, the father of Kodros — a reason which would fit well into an *Atthis* and may have been the version of Ephoros <sup>3)</sup>; in (b) we have the account of Lykurg. *In Leocrat.* 84/5, according to which the Peloponnesians γενόμενης ἀφορίας κατὰ τὴν χώραν πᾶσαν attack Athens, ὅπως ἐξαναστήσαντες τοὺς 35 ἐνοικοῦντας αὐτοὶ κατανείμονται τὴν χώραν. But in the paroemiographers <sup>4)</sup> not only the reason for the campaign is missing, but even the explanation of the proverb. A. Adler gives as the source of (b) 'Prov.'; considering the uncertainty about Eudemos, I do not venture to decide if more than the equation Κόδρος = ἐντίμος belongs to him.

## 328. PHILOCHOROS OF ATHENS

Ph. presumably is the last, and certainly the greatest, of the Attidographers proper. He is also the best known (perhaps apart from Androtion), for we have nearly twice as many fragments of him alone as of Kleidemos, Androtion, Phanodemos, Demon<sup>1)</sup> and Melanthios taken together: about 230 to 129<sup>2)</sup>. He alone has a *Bios* in the Suda<sup>3)</sup>, which, it is true, now consists of little more than the catalogue of his writings; however, it has preserved so special a detail as the name of his wife<sup>4)</sup>. In spite of the importance of this *Atthis* and of the use made of it by many late  
 10 writers<sup>5)</sup> we know less about the facts of Ph.'s life than we do about Androtion and Phanodemos, and hardly more than about Kleidemos and Demon, since, like these, he is not mentioned in contemporary inscriptions. We have only two pieces of evidence: an accidental mention in his own *Atthis*<sup>6)</sup>, and the biographical information in the Suda<sup>7)</sup> about the  
 15 circumstances of his death, the authority for which we do not know; and neither of these testimonies is free from doubt chronologically. According to the former he was officially active as *mantis* in 306/5 B.C., and therefore he certainly could not have been born later than 340 B.C.; the second, which makes Antigonos responsible for his death, causes  
 20 greater difficulties. Although nobody doubts to-day that Antigonos is the king of Macedonia, Antigonos Gonatas<sup>8)</sup>, the words ἐτελεύτησε δὲ ἐνεδρευθεὶς ὑπὸ Ἀντιγόνου, ὅτι διεβλήθη προσκεκλιμέναι τῆι Πτολεμαίου βασιλείαι are not dated, and they are ambiguous: roughly speaking they leave the choice between murder and execution<sup>9)</sup>. In the former case,  
 25 it would have to be considered whether the death of Ph. falls in the critical years before the Chremonidean War when the policy of Egypt, where Philadelphos had adopted the son of Arsinoe II by Lysimachos, prepared for a war with Macedonia<sup>10)</sup>; it then may have occurred shortly before the war opened in (most probably) 267 B.C. with the alliance of  
 30 Sparta and Athens, furthered by King Ptolemy, who as the document says ἀκολούθως τῆι τῶν προγόνων καὶ τῆι τῆς ἀδελφῆς προαιρέσει φανερός ἐστὶν σπουδάζων ὑπὲρ τῆς κοινῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐλευθερίας<sup>11)</sup>. We are not informed about the party-strife going on in Athens before Chremonides carried his motion, but we may assume that the Macedonian party did  
 35 not remain idle in view of the threatening danger; even charges of high treason against such as advocated a war with the help of Egypt would be conceivable, and both ἐτελεύτησεν and ἐνεδρευθεὶς may cover proceedings by law as well as assassination. The true question is whether or how



far the concluding year of the *Atthis* agrees with this assumption. The same *Suda* states it to have extended *ἕως Ἀντιόχου τοῦ τελευταίου τοῦ προσαγορευθέντος Θεοῦ*. Now these words contain at least one corruption, and in no case they allow of the inference generally drawn that the *Atthis* 5 included the whole of the Attic year 262/1<sup>12</sup>); but if the words *ἔτελευτήσεν ὑπὸ Ἀντιγόνου* mean that Ph. was executed by, or on the order of, Antigonos, they imply that the capitulation of Athens had taken place, and this certainly occurred in 263/2 B.C., perhaps as late as the early summer 262<sup>13</sup>). We know that Antigonos took energetic measures, as 10 energetic as those of Antipatros sixty years earlier when after the Lamian War he demanded an unconditional surrender of the city: he put a garrison into the Museion and insisted on an alteration of the constitution and the banishment of those who were responsible for the war. Unfortunately we do not know whether this last point was also a condition of the capitulation, or whether Chremonides and Glaukon fled to Ptolemy immediately 15 before it; in any case condemnations of those who were not prepared to leave their country, as for instance the aged Ph., would be quite conceivable. But a most attractive hypothesis of Ferguson<sup>14</sup>) about the issue of the war would make even a somewhat later date appear possible: 20 the last sentence of the report of Apollodoros (244 F 44) *καὶ Ἀπολλόδωρος δὲ τὸ κα[θηρ]ῆσθαι [τίθησι τ]ὴν πόλιν [ἐπ' Ἀντιπ]άτρου τ[οῦ] πρὸ Ἀρρε- νείδ[ου], καὶ φρουρὰ[ν εἰς] τὸ Μουσεῖον [τότε] εἰσῆχθ[αι ὑπ'] Ἀντιγόνου, [καὶ τὰς] ἀρχὰς [ἀνηρῆσθ]αι (?), καὶ πᾶν ἐν[ὶ] βουλευ[εῖν] (?) ἐφ[είσθαι* 'suggests a Macedonian regency'. A possible break in the secretary cycle in 261/0 25 B.C.<sup>15</sup>) and the beginning of a new cycle with the Antigonis, as well as the extraordinary introduction of the word 'peace' in the formula following the archon's name in the Delian inscription *I G XI 2, 114* from the year 261 B.C., lead to the assumption 'that it was in 261 B.C. that the war between the two monarchs, of which the Chremonidean War and 30 the capture of Athens were incidents, came to a close. It may have been not their own defeat, but the issue of the general war, leaving Athens to Antigonos, which the Athenians chose to signalize by giving the place of honour to the Antigonis in 261/0.' This would also show Athens to have settled down to the Macedonian government in a relatively short 35 time; hardly a year and a half had passed and Antigonos could entrust the administration of the town to a regularly chosen government<sup>16</sup>), and in 256 B.C. or even somewhat earlier<sup>17</sup>), when by the naval victory at Kos the Egyptian danger had been eliminated for the time being, he also could remove the garrison from the Museum. On general grounds

the interim government by a Macedonian commander or a trusted adherent of the king during the remaining part of the year 263/2 and perhaps even 262/1 B.C. would be the likeliest time for the execution of Ph. During that period attempts of the anti-Macedonian party to keep Ptolemy at war with Macedonia are as credible as their ruthless punishment when they were betrayed, or became otherwise known to the Macedonian commander. Also the statement about the concluding point of the *Atthis* can be reconciled with this date <sup>19)</sup>. I find this combination preferable not only to the ordinary date 'shortly after 261 (260)' <sup>19)</sup>, but also to the hypothesis that soon after the coalition between Antigonos and Antiochos II was concluded in 260 B.C., the war-party in Athens tried to incite another revolt which Antigonos had to suppress by executions <sup>20)</sup>. The state of our tradition being what it is this hypothesis cannot be proved, and if we want to be very cautious we may say that the death of Ph. falls in the sixties of the third century, perhaps as early as in their first years, but probably towards the end of the decade. How old he was then we cannot tell, the date of his birth-year 'not after 340 B.C.' being even more uncertain, and the synchronism of the *Vita* with Eratosthenes, who was born about 296/3 B.C. <sup>21)</sup> with its limitation <sup>20)</sup> ὡς ἐμβαλεῖν πρεσβύτηι νέον <sup>22)</sup> may be correct but does not help towards a more accurate determination.

The only fact in the long life about which we are really informed and which is independent of the precise date of his death is the connexion of Ph. with the men who looked towards Ptolemy and, putting their confidence in the naval power of Egypt, in 267/6 again took up arms *πρὸς τοὺς καταδουλοῦσθαι τὰς πόλεις ἐπιχειροῦντας*. If Antigonos had him executed or murdered, he must have been among the leaders of the movement: judging by F 67, the distinguished man, who was writing the history of Athens and who knew the will of the gods, may in his official capacity of *mantis* have supported the determined policy which was not discouraged by the defeat of the Spartans at Corinth and the death of Areus in 265 B.C., which did not allow the armistice with Antigonos <sup>23)</sup> to become peace, and which, perhaps even after the capitulation in 263/2 B.C., did not lose hope of a turn in the fortune of war. That we are to such an extent in the dark about the life of a man whose influence and authority is so clearly shown by his death can actually have but one reason: the *μάντις καὶ ἱεροσκόπος* <sup>24)</sup>, the *ἐξηγητὴς τῶν πατρίων* <sup>25)</sup>, was not a politician. It may be an accident that his name does not appear in the inscriptions though they yield that of his brother

Demetrios <sup>26</sup>), but in view of his abundant literary activity which distinctly bears the character of downright professional scholarship <sup>27</sup>) it is perhaps more likely that he deliberately kept aloof from political life and was not even a member of the Council. Therefore there would not  
5 be much sense in raising the question of his 'party attitude' <sup>28</sup>). Nor should we have any means of answering it: numerous though the fragments are from the times of Solon down to Demosthenes, they do not even allow of determining whether his fundamental attitude was democratic or conservative, to take the most general distinction starting  
10 from which we can classify Kleidemos and Androtion. In the period after the Lamian War even this contrast in some degree lost its sense. The aspect under which he seems to have regarded Perikles <sup>29</sup>) is no argument in favour of a democratic attitude; apart from the influence of Thukydides' conception it is the natural attitude of a time all too painfully  
15 aware that the greatness of Athens was a thing of the past; nor will anybody interpret F 133 as an indication of sympathy with the oligarchs. We should be better able to form a definite opinion if we could determine Ph.s ideas about Theseus, but that could only be done on the basis of an investigation of the sources of Plutarch's *Vita* the issue of which is un-  
20 certain <sup>30</sup>). Also of the constitutions of Solon and Kleisthenes the fragments yield facts but not opinions. The correct interpretation of the seisachtheia in F 114 as compared with Androtion's tendencious qualification of that measure, is merely a proof of the conscientiousness of the historian. On the other hand, his close connexion with Androtion and the  
25 use he made of his *Atthis* <sup>31</sup>) may indicate that he judged the history of Athens from the point of view of a moderate conservative; and if we add his official position and his many books about matters of cult and religion the formula 'religious conservative' may approximately describe his political creed. If according to the characterisation given by Fergus-  
30 son <sup>32</sup>) 'the great movement of social and religious change which set in from the East at the end of the fourth century B.C. was met in Athens by a fierce counter-movement which aimed to preserve, together with the city-state, its old usages and its old deities and cults', Ph. may very possibly have played an important role in this counter-movement, the  
35 spirit of which was 'that of Lycurgus of Butadae, whose pietism and fanaticism for archaising had created an artificial glow of sentiment on behalf of the ancient order'. Ph. would have been not its author but its mouthpiece, putting his learning at the disposal of this ideal, and that was not a small thing, considering its long dominance. But Ph.s literary

activity and its effect on public life, even apart from our lack of certain knowledge, does not really admit of a comparison with the practical efforts at reform of Lykurgos, even if he sympathized with the principles of the politician. In any case, the same must be valid for Demetrios of  
 5 Phaleron (different in nature though he was from Lykurgos) to whose administration Ph. seems to have given the whole of two books. In these matters he perhaps attached more importance to the aim itself than to its theoretical foundation. But all this is fairly uncertain <sup>33</sup>), and it is  
 10 his kind can hardly have been independent of his historical notions. Here the almost complete loss of the historical books dealing with the history of Ph.'s own time <sup>34</sup>) makes any definite judgement impossible. We do not find his name in the few fragments, and we cannot tell whether he shared the illusions of the radical democrats about the possibility of an  
 15 autonomous foreign policy of Athens, or whether he thought with the moderate conservatives that the abandoning of an active policy on the part of Athens and her ministering to the values of culture and religion might preserve the town as an island of peace in the struggle of the great powers. Both notions are equally hard to believe. It seems more likely  
 20 that, clearly realizing that times had altered, he acquiesced in seeking a change of 'suzerain' (called, of course, ally), because the history of the last 100 or 150 years after the breakdown of the Empire and the second naval federation had taught him that it was solely the continental power of Macedonia which threatened what at that time could be called the  
 25 'liberty of Athens'. One might label him a nationalist and an autonomist, but not an uncompromising one, and not a doctrinaire. Perhaps one had better say simply: a patriot. Possibly the exegetical pronouncement of the omen of 306/5 B.C. <sup>35</sup>) points the way to explaining the last decade of his life. At least it shows his anti-Macedonian attitude not to have been  
 30 accidental and not dependent merely on the turns in Egyptian politics. The pronouncement appears to be objective, and we have no right to doubt its having been so actually, *i.e.* rendered according to the rules of his art <sup>36</sup>). But if the *mantis* foresaw that the return of the pro-Macedonian exiles would take place sooner or later, it probably was in accordance  
 35 with his wishes that it should happen *οὐκ ἐκ μεταβολῆς τῶν πραγμάτων ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ καθεστηκυίᾳ πολιτείᾳ*: Ph. did not long for a repetition of the *dekaetia* and a conservative government supported by Macedonian arms. Also in 302/1 B.C. he passed a sufficiently severe judgement on the conduct of the 'liberator' Demetrios <sup>37</sup>), and it matters little that this

occurs in a speech: the bitterness of the concluding remark—*Δημητρίω μὲν οὖν ἰδίον τι ἐγένετο παρὰ τοὺς ἄλλους τὸ μόνον μνηθῆναι τε ἅμα καὶ ἐποπτεῦσαι, καὶ τοὺς χρόνους τῆς τελετῆς τοὺς πατέριους μετακινήθηναι*— is unmistakable. Lastly, from the scheme of his work as far as it is 5 recognizable<sup>38)</sup> we may draw the inference that he saw the history of Athens from the view-point first of her hegemony, and later, when that had been lost, of her freedom from foreign sovereignty. The epochal years of his *Atthis* which determine its division into books (or groups of books) seem to have been the acquisition of the hegemony in 462/1 10 B.C., its breakdown in 404/3, Philip's accession in 360/59, the first introduction of a Macedonian garrison in 322/1 (318/7).

The true nature of Ph. and his work can hardly be determined by his convictions about home-policy or by his official position as a *mantis*. That he took this office seriously and that he believed in his art, is shown 15 definitely by F 67 and F 135<sup>39)</sup>, and we may consider his great systematic work *Περὶ μαντικῆς* in the light of these fragments, which does not mean that its author indiscriminately regarded any form of divination down to the *ἐγγαστρίμυθοι γυναῖκες* as infallible revelations. We perceive the facts, no more, and no particulars, just as we perceive that in the 20 domain of cult Ph. established the *πάτρια* and held to them<sup>40)</sup> even though he sometimes explained a cultic custom rationally (not rationalistically<sup>41)</sup>). I doubt whether one can agree with Wilamowitz' statement: 'it does not seem to accord with his time that Ph. in his quality of prophet and interpreter of omens played a political rôle'<sup>42)</sup>. Apart from the fact 25 that we do not know whether, or how far, the political influence of Ph. was merely due to his official position as a *mantis*, there is not the least doubt that 'the faith in divination never disappeared'; it even received new support from the Stoa at that very time. If it is correct (I cannot say whether it is, but I do not believe it to be true) that 'the successors 30 of Alexander were not accompanied by a prophet who had an influence like Aristodemus of Telmessos' this does not matter anything for Athens, where even an Epikuros not only left a place to the old gods in his godless system, but was manifestly attached to these conceptions by his feelings<sup>43)</sup>. It is a matter of course that the faith of a man of the social and intellectual 35 standing of Ph. was not that of the Wilamowitzian 'Kräuterweib von Eleusis', nor would there be any sense in comparing it with the faith, for instance, of Sophokles or Herodotos. But what we do recognize and what we have to take as proof of the seriousness of his religious attitude<sup>44)</sup>

is his manner of using the facts of cult for consciously building up a theological system. As far as we can see, his aim is not so much an apology for popular beliefs or a removal of obnoxious details, as an endeavour to understand the nature of the popular gods by interpreting them theolog-  
 5 logically. This interpretation (again as far as we can see) has no connexion with philosophical theology taken in a narrower sense; the question whether there are gods, and similar ones as to the nature of τὸ θεῖον are remote from it. On the other hand, we are not in a position to affirm or to deny that Ph.'s theology was affected by Orphic, Pythagorean, or other  
 10 mystic influences which, from another side, had increasingly attacked and partly transformed early Greek religion and piety since the sixth century B.C. <sup>46</sup>), though, until the contrary is proved, I should be extremely sceptical of this. Nothing, for instance, can be learnt in regard either to the 'faith' or the 'theology' of Ph. from his describing Orpheus as a  
 15 *mantis* in Περὶ μαντικῆς, and from his dealing somewhat fully with the poems ascribed to him <sup>46</sup>); nor do his special books about Pythagoreanism, of which we know nothing but the titles, teach us anything in this respect <sup>47</sup>). But F 6, being a verbatim quotation, is extremely illuminating (especially if taken together with F 5): οὐ γὰρ, ὡσπερ ἐνιοὶ λέγουσιν,  
 20 βωμολόχον τινὰ καὶ κόβαλον γίνεσθαι νομιστέον τὸν Διόνυσον. Traces not altogether vague seem to indicate that Ph. treated the great gods systematically as to their qualities and to their spheres of action as shown by their cultic epithets, if only these were correctly understood <sup>48</sup>). He gave incidentally (or so it seems) a history of the introduction of these gods,  
 25 distinguishing their relative periods <sup>49</sup>) and endeavouring in some measure to set forth their significance for the development of the human race. He did not, however, conceive them simply as exponents of Culture, as a certain philosophic theory did, which explained them as deified inventors or even inventions. His Dionysos is neither the wine nor the  
 30 deified inventor of the vine; he is the real god, who taught an Athenian king the mixing of wine and water, and who because of this was worshipped as (Διόνυσος) Ὀρθός <sup>50</sup>). Even if his tomb was mentioned by Ph., which is not quite certain <sup>51</sup>), the conception is very remote from Euhemerism and from the doctrines which, under the influence of contempo-  
 35 rary political claims, were worked into a new system of belief (or disbelief) in gods <sup>52</sup>). For Ph. the actual inventors, or at least the bringers of culture, are kings, not gods <sup>53</sup>), and they do not even become gods when (like Kekrops or Erechtheus) they obtain a cult in the precinct of one of the great gods. There is not so much as a vestige of physical inter-

pretation of divine powers; and rationalism, though it had penetrated into the *Atthides* long since, is confined to the heroic myths, where it had been legitimate since Hekataios, and there it is kept within reasonable limits <sup>54</sup>). It is only Ph.s strong tendency to *συνοικειούν* which comes within the realm of theological speculation; it may be noted that the Stoa adopted this tendency which is already apparent in the much earlier literature *Περὶ τελετῶν*. It is a grievous gap in our knowledge that with regard to it we can only state bare facts <sup>55</sup>); we know nothing in the way of considerations and reasons. A second gap may be called the fact <sup>10</sup> (although it hardly concerns 'faith') that, as the consequence of the almost entire loss of Ph.s books dealing with his own time, we must refrain from forming an opinion as to whether Ph. 'made the gods intervene somehow, or at least wished to show in the history of states the directive power of a purposeful deity' <sup>56</sup>). This means that, generally speaking, <sup>15</sup> we do not know whether he saw historical events under a philosophical (or rather theological) aspect, as *e.g.* Herodotos did—an attitude not necessarily required in a Chronicle; and in particular whether in the *Atthis* he assigned a rôle to *Τύχη* about whom his older contemporary, Demetrios of Phaleron, had written a book <sup>57</sup>). Judging by the books <sup>20</sup> of which we can to some degree form an idea we can at least state that he wrote a political, not an ecclesiastical history, and that his faith, whatever it may have been, did not impair the simplicity and realism of his record. Fragments like 133 and 135 prove definitely that the *Atthis* was also free from interpretations in the style of Timaios; if they <sup>25</sup> had occurred we should hear of them. But even if in some respects the comparison with Lampon of the Periclean period appears to be obvious (although Lampon did not write either a history of Athens or anything else), and may be suitable for illustrating the influence of Ph.s official position as a *mantis* on his historical work, the extensive literary activity <sup>30</sup> of the younger man is due not only to the changes wrought by time but to a difference in nature as well.

For forming an idea of this nature the list of Ph.s works with its 27 titles, which will be treated more fully below, is our most important evidence, because it enables us to see at once what is new and peculiar <sup>35</sup> in the personality of this author, and sum it up in a short formula: *Ph. is the first scholar among the Atthidographers*. He is not simply a chronicler of Athenian history as his predecessors were who, apart from their chronicle, wrote at the utmost one other book arising either from the exercise of an office connected with cult <sup>57</sup>), or from an accidental

personal experience <sup>58</sup>). He is a man of research who in numerous monographs systematically includes the whole domain of Attic history and Attic religious life in the widest sense of the word. Special books about the Tetrapolis, Salamis, Delos, are ranged beside the *Atthis*.

5 The character of the voluminous work about the lore of his art <sup>59</sup>) was essentially different, as far as we can see, from the book about rites which the exegete Kleidemos composed for practical use and perhaps not without a political bias <sup>60</sup>). It was evidently far more nearly akin to his own treatises, partly historical, partly antiquarian, about some

10 special subjects in the domain of cult, as, for instance, *Περὶ θυσιῶν, ἑορτῶν, ἡμερῶν, ἱερῶν, καθαρμῶν*. These books probably dealt (mostly or exclusively) with Athenian sacrifices, festivals, *etc.*; the books *Περὶ τῶν Ἀθῆνησι ἀγῶνων* and *Περὶ μυστηρίων τῶν Ἀθῆνησιν* carry this limitation in the title, and the collection of inscriptions only contained *Ἐπιγράμματα*

15 *Ἀττικά* <sup>61</sup>). This may, incidentally, be the first collection of this kind and would in that case be the genuine predecessor of Krateros' *Psephismata*. Athens was unmistakably the centre of all Ph.s literary work, and it is this rootedness in his native soil which distinguishes him <sup>62</sup>) from the later scholars of Aristotelian or Alexandrine type who often were foreigners not intimately attached to any country. We must, however, not stress this point unduly: the voluminous and systematic work *Περὶ μαντικῆς* as well as presumably *Περὶ ἡμερῶν* certainly did touch on matters not specifically Athenian <sup>63</sup>). Also for *Περὶ ἐνυπνίων* <sup>64</sup>) and *Εὐρήματα* — a favourite subject in the Peripatetic school, but not peculiar to it <sup>65</sup>) — a

25 strict local limitation is hardly conceivable, though perhaps not altogether impossible. Our material for most of these special books is so scanty that we are compelled to speak with the utmost caution. But entering the philological and antiquarian domain in a narrower sense, we begin to see somewhat more clearly: Athens cannot very well have been the centre

30 in the two books about Pythagoreanism, the *Σύμβολα* which presumably was systematic, and the *Συναγωγὴ ἡρωίδων ἦτοι Πυθαγορείων γυναικῶν* which may have been biographical <sup>66</sup>). The homogeneous group of Ph.s works on literature consists of one book *Περὶ τραγωιδιῶν*, one about Euripides, and five (!) about the myths of Sophokles, but it also contains

35 a book about Alkman which it may be difficult to connect with Athens. A book on Homer (F 209-211) has been suggested, but the suggestion remains uncertain. Far more important is the fact that we can recognize the form of the *Περὶ*-book <sup>67</sup>) in the few preserved fragments. This distinctly literary *genre* begins to supersede, together with the typically scientific



forms of the letter <sup>68</sup>) and the polemical treatise <sup>69</sup>), the *Προβλήματα* 'Ομηρικά and similar books of the pre-Aristotelian and of the Aristotelian period. The *Περί*-books are not in any way limited as to their contents; they may deal with historical as well as with literary questions, and they may contain interpretations of difficult or contested passages of the text. I should not venture to maintain 'manifest dependence on Aristotle' <sup>70</sup>) for Ph.; it might be conceivable in the case of Demon, his somewhat older contemporary, who first among the Attidographers seems to have turned to scholarship in his *Παροιμιαί*, a scholarship still under the influence of philosophy <sup>71</sup>). It is difficult to define Ph.'s attitude towards philosophy. His interest in Pythagoreanism may be important, and there may be found connecting links with Pythagorean doctrine in his theological work, particularly in *Περί ἡμερῶν*. But too little is left for us even to make suggestions; also Pythagoras has a position peculiar to himself among philosophers. We can safely state that there are no vestiges in Ph. of a definite philosophic attitude, or even of an interest in philosophy: the fragments concerned with the history of the Academy <sup>72</sup>) are purely historical. It is remarkable in the (perhaps detailed) discussion on Aristotle's foundation of his own school that Ph. takes into account social considerations and constitutional law; his attention may have been directed to these points by the νόμος Ἀττικὸς κατὰ τῶν φιλοσοφούντων γραφεῖς, ὃν Σοφοκλῆς Ἀμφικλείδου Σουιεὺς εἶπεν κτλ., and by the difficulties thence arising for the Peripatos under the leadership of Theophrastos <sup>73</sup>). On the other hand we find no indication of an antagonism on principle to philosophy in general—as we find it in Lampon on the one hand, Isokrates and Theopompos <sup>74</sup>) on the other—or of personal dislike to individual philosophers: we should know if he had expressed unfavourable opinions on Plato or Aristotle or even Theophrastos, Zenon, Epikuros <sup>75</sup>). But, as I said before, there is no vestige of an actual interest in philosophy, and among his numerous books there is not one touching on questions of physics or science. Nor is there (to state another negative fact) any book by Ph. about another town or country than Athens, or any parallel to the book about Alkman in the group concerned with literature. The *Σαλαμῖνος κτίσις* and the *Δηλιακά* <sup>76</sup>), of which unfortunately no fragments have been preserved, belong to the sphere of Athenian history. The *Ἡπειρωτικά*—a title once believed to be confirmed by F 225—owes its existence to a slip of the pen in the Epitome of Harpokration s.v. Βούχεται, where the Mss. of the complete Lexicon correctly quote Φιλοστέφανος <sup>77</sup>). Ph. is not a polyhistor in the

style of the sophists and of Hellanikos, still less a compiler in the manner of Alexandros Polyhistor.

It may be advisable to supply reasons for the formula adopted above <sup>78</sup>) by collecting from the fragments all points capable of informing us about the character of the 'scholar' Ph. In doing so, it is true, the border-line between the historian, the author of the *Atthis*, and the author of the other works cannot always be drawn accurately, nor is there a real necessity to do so because the *Atthis* makes use of the results of Ph.'s research throughout and, as a whole, must also be regarded as a learned book. The distinction is not vital if we acknowledge the unity of the scholarly personality: though it may have matured in the course of time it is in all essentials equally recognizable in all of his greater works. We must, it is true, stress again and again our lack of knowledge as to details, for we are dealing with the scantiest remains of an abundant literary activity, remains preserved only in scraps; but the little that has come down to us creates an uncommonly favourable impression, even (or particularly) if compared with Androton. When set beside this author, whom Ph. followed largely in the first six books of his *Atthis*, he is distinguished by the wide range of his interests and by his extensive reading in many spheres which makes the comparison with the Peripatos appear justified, provided one makes the necessary reservations and does not ignore the differences. Ph. is the only Atthidographer of whom we can state with a certain confidence that he is not simply one in a series. He does not merely draw upon local tradition and upon his predecessors, but he was intimately acquainted with Great History: he seems to have known Herodotos well <sup>79</sup>) and to have used Thukydidēs extensively without sacrificing his independence to him <sup>80</sup>); one gets the impression that he fully understood the work and the ideas of the latter—not a common thing in antiquity. Acquaintance with Kallisthenes <sup>81</sup>), Anaximenes <sup>82</sup>), Theopompos, and Ephoros <sup>83</sup>) is quite possible. He sometimes seems to have opposed Theopompos in particular, he also contradicts Ephoros, although not on questions strictly historical. No doubt he also read the contemporary historians (not merely the Atthidographers like Demon) as far as their books had been published, *i.e.* Diyllos and perhaps Demochares. Considering the very small number of fragments from books 10-17 we cannot prove this, and we can, of course, still less form an opinion about his attitude towards them <sup>84</sup>); but F 126 does seem to allow of the inference that finding divergent statements as to the reign of an early Macedonian king he

consulted a Macedonian historian. Most important is his reference to the Κρητες in the Theseus story F 17, which reads exactly like the ἐπιχώριοι quotations in Herodotos; it may surely be assumed to derive from a book. Altogether references to authorities and (anonymous) polemic<sup>85</sup>) seem to have been frequent, even apart from the probably continuous criticism of Demon<sup>86</sup>). These things show the scholar; so does the reference to poets in order to establish historical facts<sup>87</sup>), and the independent attitude towards authors like Androtion and Thukydidēs whom we may assume to have been his main historical sources<sup>88</sup>).

10 On the other hand he did not use Aristotle's 'Αθπ.<sup>89</sup>), nor could he be expected to do so: the 'Αθπ., on the contrary, depends upon the *Atthides* in its historical sections and on Androtion in particular, whom Ph. himself always had before him. Ph. also had much more information about the early institutions than occurs in the occasional remarks of

15 Aristotle, and even about conditions at the time of Lykurgos the 'Αθπ. hardly supplied any facts but such as Ph. either knew himself or could have found more fully in Demetrios of Phaleron. It is regrettable that we cannot decide whether he consulted the books either of that author or of Theophrastos<sup>90</sup>); he may have gone direct to the material they

20 used, but even if he did this one must, of course, not infer antagonism to the Peripatos, whose founder he defended against personal slander<sup>91</sup>). The spirit of the school may have produced an uncanny feeling in Ph., but the reason for his having held aloof from it may chiefly be found in the fact that his own works and methods were rooted in the earlier free

25 research. This becomes even more manifest when in a domain entirely concerned with history of literature we find Ph. to be dependent (in a degree which we cannot estimate) on an earlier outsider: it appears certain to me that he made extensive use of the books of Herakleides of Pontos<sup>92</sup>). Certainly he did not follow him uncritically, nor can there

30 be much doubt that Ph. himself had an intimate knowledge of the early history of music and literature. But it is only natural for a scholar to pay regard to the most recent books, and Herakleides certainly was one of the most distinguished, if not the most distinguished, among the historians of literature in the epoch to which we assign the corresponding

35 books of Ph. I do not find any connexion with the 'big noise' Aristoxenos, nor does it seem likely that Ph. should have used him<sup>93</sup>). As this entire literature is preserved only in scraps, we must, of course, speak with the utmost caution. There is actually only one point to be affirmed with confidence: the very fragments of the scientific books of Ph. enable us

to recognize a well-read, serious, and sensible man of research; even in our scanty tradition we come upon the cautious λέγεται <sup>94</sup>). Naturally, more or less certain vestiges of local patriotism are to be found in the 'Archaeology', but so far as we can see it is quite moderate even in the *5* *Atthis* <sup>95</sup>): it is, for instance, not improbable that early scholarship knew the thesis that Homer was an Athenian <sup>96</sup>)—for Ph. he was Argive and (in contrast with the sensational hypothesis of Ephoros, which greatly impressed the compiler of the *Parian Marble*) earlier than Hesiod, both statements being in agreement with the Pontic Herakleides, who was *10* evidently the first to conduct the counter-proof against Ephoros, as is shown by Chamaileon's disputing his claim to priority <sup>97</sup>). That Tyrtaios was an Athenian <sup>98</sup>) was the accepted opinion of Ph.s time, it had been mentioned in the book of Kallisthenes shortly before; this is therefore no evidence of a particular local patriotism. Ph. mistrusts anything *15* sensational, any scandalous stories, no matter whether they have their origin in Comedy or in contemporary school gossip: he disproves the slander about Aristotle by referring to his social position in Athens <sup>99</sup>), and that about Euripides by documents <sup>100</sup>). In his capacity as interpreter of texts he certainly did not reject on principle any attempts at finding *20* contemporary allusions provided their possibility could be supported by facts <sup>101</sup>), but he did summarily reject alleged allusions if chronology disproved them <sup>102</sup>). Indisputable is his ample acquaintance with literature without which he could, as a matter of fact, not have written either on Tragedy or on Alkman, even though the nature of the fragments does not always *25* allow of ascertaining which quotations and what evidence we may trace back to him: fragments like F 43 Φιλόχορος ἐν ἔ ' Ἀρχιλοχον ἐπαγόμενος μάρτυρα <sup>103</sup>) or F 226 Φιλόχορος δέ φησι . . . καὶ γὰρ Ἡσίοδον οὕτω λέγειν are unfortunately exceptional. But apart from Homer and Hesiod, of whom he wrote βίαι <sup>104</sup>), we find the names of the pre-Homeric poets Linos <sup>105</sup>), *30* Musaios <sup>106</sup>), Orpheus, whose alleged works he knew intimately <sup>107</sup>), and Boio <sup>108</sup>). Some of the quotations are taken from Περὶ μαντικῆς, but most fragments cannot be assigned definitely to any of his books. Whether he drew upon Hesiod in Περὶ ἡμερῶν is a factual question which I am not prepared to answer positively; also in regard to F 195 the *35* question must remain open whether he consulted the Homeric hymn to Hermes. As to the authenticity of the poems of Epicharmos he exercised criticism <sup>109</sup>); Stesichoros appears in F 213, but only as the son of Hesiod. Otherwise no mention of a lyric poet is certain, but the fact that we have none but accidental quotations must be taken into account,

for the book about Alkman is evidence of Ph.s acquaintance with this domain. About Tragedy he published at least three books, and he evidently knew the authors of Old Comedy<sup>110</sup>). Nowhere he keeps his literary knowledge in watertight compartments, he utilizes it for the whole range of his work: in *Περὶ μαντικῆς* he characterizes Orpheus and Epicharmos on the basis of his critical research on their books; in the *Atthis* (F 43) Archilochos appears as a witness for the claims on a Thracian trading centre; and the work about the Sophoclean myths has almost certainly be used for the 'Archaeology' in the same work<sup>111</sup>). One should also observe the explanation of artistic representations, of which again F 7 was probably not the only instance. Among Ph.s principles of interpretation the wide use he made of etymology deserves a special mention.. Naturally we must not expect a real comprehension of language; the question is merely whether Ph. had definite general principles, and what in particular was his attitude towards the method which was followed in the *Kratylos* (as has been recently suggested under the influence of Herakleides of Pontos<sup>112</sup>), which was not rejected by Aristotle, and which gained particular importance in the Stoa. I do not think that we can answer these questions with the means at our disposal, for we do not find in the fragments etymologies for instance of words expressing fundamental ideas or names of gods; what we find are interpretations of what might be called historical names. These interpretations are plain and sober; they are not burdened with purposes extending beyond the immediate aim of understanding the word. In my opinion they create the impression of not originating from the philosophical contemplation of language, nor of being concerned with the fundamental philosophic problems of νόμος *versus* φύσις and the origin of language (in modern terms, with the relation of words to things). They rather seem to belong to the domain of the far older 'popular' etymology, the term being taken in its widest sense as distinguished from the systematic, theoretical, 'scientific' consideration of language (even if these scientific linguists often use results of pre-scientific etymology), comprehending the etymological interpretations found in all Greek poetry which (I think) played an important part also in the explanations given by the λόγοι ἀνδρῶν<sup>113</sup>). The nature of this etymology and the rôle it played, as well as its difference from the etymology of Herakleitos, the Stoa, and Apollodoros (the last furnishing the clearest contrast to Ph.) will be best perceived from a simple enumeration: the fundamental feature is their factual character, their immediate connexion with mythical or historical

- events, conditions, or given local facts. Thus the Areiopagos (F 3) simply has its name from the trial of Ares pleaded there, the questions who Ares was and what the name means, not being brought up at all; thus the Boedromia (F 13) derive from the βοηθεῖν σπουδῇ ascribed to Ion, the linguistic addition βοηδρομεῖν γὰρ τὸ βοηθεῖν ὀνομάζετο most probably belonging to the quotation from Ph.; the imperfect tense still shows the principle of method, *viz.* the help given for the explanation by the early usage of the language. This principle is evident for instance when the name Ἀλῶια (F 83) is derived ἀπὸ τοῦ τότε τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τὰς διατριβάς ποιεῖσθαι περὶ τὰς ἔλως, or even more clearly when two demes are called Οἶον (F 29) because μόνον οἶον ἐκάλουν οἱ ἀρχαῖοι <sup>114</sup>). We note further the etymology of the λαοί (F 95) named from the λίθοι of the Cecropian census of the people, and the ἄστν (F 2) derived from στῆσαι ἐκ τῆς πλάνης of the earliest men. The same principle is generally used in regard to matters of fact and history, whenever the question is about the time, or the original nature, of a custom, its alterations, or the (abusive) application of a term <sup>115</sup>). The names of demes are mostly derived from their eponymous heroes <sup>116</sup>), this being the simplest explanation and, moreover, apparently confirmed by the cult. But for Οἶον (F 29) Ph. supplied a regular etymology, and as to the Κεραμεῖς (F 25) the κεραμική τέχνη of the inhabitants competes with the name of the hero Keramos. The following seem to be purely popular etymologies: the derivation of Σίντιες from σίνεσθαι (F 101), of τύραννος from the Τυρρηνοί (F 100; although in this case the historical background, *viz.* the equation of Τυρρηνοί with Πελασγοί is evident), of the Πελασγοί from the πελαργοί (F 99), of the σεισάχθεια from ἄχθος (F 114) <sup>117</sup>), of θύμος from θυμιασις and θύη (F 194). The interpretation of the heroic name Χοιρῶλη, ἴσως διὰ τὸ πολὺπαιδα γεγενῆσθαι (F 90), is not essentially different, but where Ph. deals with divine powers he does not attenuate them by etymology: θριαί and θριάσθαι in F 195 are called thus from the Θριαί; the Θυηλαί in F 178 even seem to have been first personified by Ph. out of certain θυσίαι. Also, when Dionysos is called Ὅρθός because of the consequences of his invention (F 5), this explains only the cult-name, like F 175, and does not affect the personality of the god.
- 35 These indications of scholarship show Ph. in close touch not only with the history, but also with the science of his time. If one adds the Ὀλυμπιάδες <sup>118</sup>), which point to a professional concern with the auxiliary science of chronology <sup>119</sup>), one becomes rather sceptical towards the very

artificial attempts at tracing back this varied literary activity entirely to his 'position as a priest' and the 'faith in his vocation' <sup>120</sup>). The mental attitude of the *mantis* is certainly not a subordinate feature, but it is not the only characteristic of Ph. I am quite willing to admit that the work about his own art contains four books whereas the special writings concerned with cults only had one or two each, but it must not be overlooked that the character of *Περὶ μαντικῆς* is historical at least in great portions of the work <sup>121</sup>), and that there is also a voluminous work among the writings concerned with history of literature and with textual criticism—the five books *Περὶ τῶν Σοφοκλέους μύθων*. Further it must be stated that *if* the learned treatises belong to the first half of Ph.'s life, and the *Atthis* to his old age <sup>122</sup>), this work of old age furnishes distinct proof that Ph. never lost the mental attitude of *mantis*, unless (which is quite possible) he acquired it in the course of his life and allowed it a greater influence on his writing with his advancing years. It is a fact that we have altogether only two fragments, 67 and 135, which permit of recognizing indisputably his faith in divination: the former is quoted from the *Atthis* and refers to events of his own time which he interpreted officially in his capacity of *mantis*; the latter can be assigned to the *Atthis* with certainty, and it is important because it explains the catastrophe of 413/2 B.C. by the fact that the official seer in the headquarters of Nikias did not possess sufficient knowledge of the rules of his art. That is not much, but fortunately it is enough for proving wrong the picture which Laqueur <sup>123</sup>) has drawn of the 'inner development' of Ph. Only a gravely mistaken interpretation of the two fragments made possible the contention that 'the aged Ph. took a different position towards sacred questions from his earlier self', *viz.* that in the course of his life he changed 'from a religious attitude to a more sceptical one', and that we recognize 'two creative periods' in the second of which 'the tie was loosened which had connected Atthidography with the investigation of matters of cult, and Ph. himself moved away from the beginnings which were influenced by his sacred profession to become the political chronicler of the city, and finally to sell himself entirely to the present time'. One need not point to the abundance of material about matters of cult worked into the *Atthis* and to the evident difference in this respect of the first six books of Ph.'s work from the *Atthis* of Androtion upon which he built those books <sup>124</sup>): *if* Ph. did undergo a development the change was in the opposite direction, from purely learned research work to the piety and the reformatory earnestness which became manifest in the *Atthis*. Such a

development would be possible and psychologically conceivable, only it is not demonstrable, nor suggested by the material at our disposal. On the other hand, this material and everything else we know about the *Atthis* corroborates our formula <sup>125</sup>) that here the scholarly mind has come in, producing on the soil of Attica a personality in whom the qualities of the priest, the patriot, and the man of research are combined and united, so far as I can see, into a singleness of purpose <sup>126</sup>). This harmonious combination, in which the dominant component is the scholarly mind, constitutes the importance of Ph. within the limits of his nature and his time. We will not exaggerate this importance, but the general characterization of the Atthidographers as given by Ed. Schwartz <sup>127</sup>)—‘of course, these men were not great geniuses and authors; if they had been how would they have written chronicles?’—does not do full justice to the differences between the individual writers. If we place the great chronicle correctly as to time, assigning its composition to the late nineties and the eighties of the third century B.C. <sup>128</sup>); if we take as our starting-point the numerous special papers by no means exclusively concerned with matters of cult, but dealing with chronology, antiquities, and literature even beyond the borders of Attica, also treating some regions like the Tetrapolis, Salamis, and the island Delos, perhaps even some periods of Attic history, specially <sup>129</sup>)—then our first impression is that Ph. did intensive and serious research and that he carefully prepared for his great task. Whether he distinctly visualized this task from the first, or whether some external and accidental cause (*viz.* the publication <sup>130</sup>) of Demon’s *Atthis* <sup>130</sup>) convinced him that a new history of Athens was needed; or again whether he felt himself to be a follower of Androtion <sup>131</sup>), and how far he changed the mainly political character of that author’s work into something more truly historical—all these are questions not admitting of a definite answer. And perhaps they are not questions of primary importance. Far more important is the fact that Ph., when at about fifty years of age he chose the form of a chronicle because that was the traditional form for the history of a town and the appropriate one even if the town was Athens, tackled his task in the spirit of a true historian. Here the arrangement of the *Atthis* speaks clearly: if it took Ph. eleven books to record the 55 years from the government of Demetrios of Phaleron down to the Chremonidean War, *i.e.* for his own time when Athens was fighting against the fate of becoming a Macedonian town; when, on the other hand, he despatched the entire previous history of more than a thousand years in



six books, these facts are full evidence of his intention to be a historian like his countrymen and contemporaries Diyllos and Demochares. And a historian he was as truly as Sallustius, Livy, or Tacitus; the *προτιθέναι τοὺς ἀρχοντας* is in his case really merely a matter of form <sup>132</sup>). Also the very fact that he treated the matters of cult and comprehended the antiquarian material in special books makes it obvious that he was well aware of the difference between a historical record (even when this included the development of the constitution) and a description of conditions—a difference which Theopompos failed to recognize when choosing the form of the Ionian *ιστορίη* for his *Philippika* <sup>133</sup>). In my opinion one does not do justice to the great narrative work of Ph. by merely acknowledging its 'dispassionate solidity of historical research', while 'political pathos appeared for the last time in the speeches of Demosthenes and perhaps in the historical work of his nephew Demochares' <sup>134</sup>).

Maybe we had better reserve our judgement altogether because the almost complete loss of the contemporary books of the *Atthis* <sup>135</sup>) does not allow of a really well-founded opinion, but one feels reluctant to deny all political interest to a man who bore witness with his life to his convictions, and who as the chronicler of his native town followed and continued Androtion, a writer of quite pronounced political tendency and who, when exiled, evidently tried to influence politics by his historical work. Even if the fragments furnish sadly few particulars, and even if we do not know anything at all about Demon's political attitude <sup>136</sup>), it seems wrong to accord to Ph. only 'romantically antiquarian interests which led to action at the utmost in the religious sphere' <sup>137</sup>). If in view of the state of the preservation of the *Atthis* (which we shall try to explain below) one does not dare to call him a real historian (as I do unhesitatingly), one should at least accept the characterization given by Wilamowitz <sup>138</sup>): 'The exegete Philochoros gave a worthy conclusion to the national chronicle, surpassing all his predecessors by his learning, even sometimes showing critical judgement, but always full of that noble love for his country, its gods and its liberty, to which he bore witness with his life and by his death'. In my opinion even this characterization does not do full justice to the nature and to the importance of Ph.'s greatest (and last) work; but, in any case, its author was a scholar steeped in the history and the religion of his native town, though neither parochial in his outlook nor a fanatic but of a mind open to all interests of his time and of his country in particular. From these his work, which was largely, though not exclusively, devoted to this his country and its position in the new

political circumstances of the Greek world, draws its strength; they lift it above the narrowness of local history. It is significant and in harmony with the facts stated that, although he followed and set forth the tradition of his country, and although he was a patriot by nature, he seems to have  
 5 been quite free from the tendency to unbridled panegyric manifest in Phanodemos<sup>139</sup>) He was body and soul Athenian, but he was too sound a scholar to make Homer originate from Athens<sup>140</sup>).

We have been anticipating and touching on fundamental questions. The answers are not capable of strict proof but (as far as this is possible) they  
 10 are founded on the details of the material preserved which in its turn (the circle is inevitable) must be considered in the light of these answers. We return to the particulars and try to form a picture of the achievement of the last Attidographer, in particular of his main work. The list of his writings in the Suda, although giving 21 titles, is not complete; it  
 15 omits works like *Περὶ ἑορτῶν*<sup>141</sup>) quoted by Harpokration alone, and *Περὶ ἡμερῶν*<sup>142</sup>) used (indirectly?) by Proklos in his commentary on Hesiod and on which the Scholia on Plato and the Lexicon of Photios may have drawn too. The Scholia on the *Hekabe* of Euripides alone yield two more titles of works on Tragedy, viz. the *Περὶ τραγωιδιῶν σύγγραμμα* and the  
 20 *Πρὸς Ἀσκληπιάδην ἐπιστολή*<sup>143</sup>). Another letter, probably on questions of heortology, is quoted by Photios<sup>144</sup>), and a book *Περὶ ἐνυπνίων* is indicated, though not with definite certainty, by Tertullianus<sup>145</sup>). The total number of Ph.s works is thus increased to 27 titles with at least 52 books. The provenance of the list of T I is doubtful: a biography (not the  
 25 *Πῖναξ*) seems indicated, as the titles are not arranged in alphabetical order nor according to any fixed principle except that the list opens with Ph.s main work and that in the course of the enumeration we find groups belonging together as to their subjects, though no group includes all the works on cognate subjects. Nothing justifies the attempt made again and  
 30 again to reduce the number of titles (not at all too large for a long life devoted to learning and to the service of the gods) by identifying some of them with each other. These attempts might be permitted on principles of method if two lists from different *Vitae* had been fused together as sometimes happens in the Suda, or if some of the titles them-  
 35 selves suggested identity; but the present list does not support suggestions of this kind. The conjecture e.g. that the book *Περὶ μαντικῆς*, of the contents of which we can up to a point form an idea, and the separate paper *Περὶ συμβόλων*, the contents of which we cannot determine with

certainty, 'might have formed one work' <sup>146</sup>) cannot be supported even by arguments of probability. Mueller's equation <sup>147</sup>) of the letter to Asklepiades with the *Σύγγραμμα περί τραγωιδιῶν* (not to mention the further equation with *Περί Εὐριπίδου*) is impossible because of the tradition itself, for both quotations are traceable to Didymos. The idea of declaring *Περί εὐρημάτων* to be an extract from the *Atthis* is ridiculous in view of the fact that *Heuremata* are a favourite subject of historical and philosophical research in the fourth century <sup>148</sup>): we know books of that title not only by Ephoros but also by the first three leaders of the Peripatos, *viz.* Aristotle, Theophrastos, Straton; further by Herakleides of Pontos and others, *e.g.* by Skamon and 'Simonides', about the nature of which we have no particular information. These fashionable identifications are not clever; their authors simply do not feel it necessary to reflect upon the aim and the nature of the individual books. It is even less worth while to refute the suggestion that the *Πρὸς Δήμωνα ἀντιγραφὴ* and the *Ἀρξάντες ἀπὸ Σωκρατίδου μέχρι Ἀπολλοδώρου* are parts of the *Atthis*. Taking into account the conditions of literature at that time, the personality of Ph., and the tradition of his works, we shall find it much more likely that we do not possess the titles of all the books and pamphlets he wrote; any find of papyri may have surprises in store for us <sup>149</sup>), and even the preserved fragments themselves make the surmise of a book *Περί Ὀμήρου* <sup>150</sup>) appear not impossible. But it is certainly not an accident that there is no special book about Eleusis: the *mantis* of the State had no particular connexions with Eleusis, and perhaps he found the book of Melanthios (326 F 2-4) sufficient <sup>151</sup>).

As far as we can see all works of Ph. (which will better be dealt with in connexion with the respective fragments), not only the *Atthis*, have been used by later authors, as they were widely considered to be authoritative. Of course, it is an exaggeration to state that by the *Atthis* of Ph. 'the entire preceding Atthidographic literature became antiquated' <sup>152</sup>), but in fact his book did very soon become the main work for the commentators and lexicographers, though in particular cases they consulted Kleidemos, Phanodemos, and in particular Androtion besides. Nor was it superseded by the *Epitome* <sup>153</sup>), at least not in scientific circles. We can follow up the use made of the *Atthis* from the third century onward by Kallimachos <sup>154</sup>), Eratosthenes, Istros, Hermippos, Sotion <sup>155</sup>), Apollodoros <sup>156</sup>), Philodemos <sup>157</sup>), Lysimachides, Apion, and others. It was a sort of handbook also for Didymos and Dionysios of Halikarnassos, of whom the former always consulted it first and the latter as the only

book on Athenian history <sup>158</sup>). As far as we can see this is valid also for Strabo <sup>159</sup>) and for almost all the lexicographers; it is uncertain in regard to Plutarch, who seems to have taken the ample Philochorean material of his *Life of Theseus* from Istros' *Συναγωγή*. His only other quotation in the *Life of Nicias* <sup>160</sup>) is evidently not direct, but taken from a Hellenistic biography.

It is not possible to discuss here in detail the history of the tradition, for such an investigation could not be confined to Ph.; it would have to include *e.g.* the historical sources for the interpretation of authors and for lexicography generally. As far as I can see, extensive direct use of Ph. (and not only of him, but of the learned original works of early Hellenism generally) ceases with Didymos and the early Empire. This need not be (and probably is not) valid equally for all of Ph.'s works: the *Atthis* may still have been read when most of the special writings, even those the subject of which always met with a lively interest, had been absorbed by the later collections of mostly lexicographical character. The quotations derived from these are certain to be partly second- (or even third-) hand, and this may furnish some (not the whole) explanation of the fact that of a number of books we only know the titles and have no quotations, and perhaps also of the other fact that alongside of only 91 quotations with the title of a book there occur 133 (139) without it. It is further manifest that the rationalistic interpretations of myths, deriving mainly from the *Atthis*, were in an early phase (probably long before Christian scholarship made use of them) transferred from their original context into another and put into the service of some (semi-) philosophic theory. If we examine without prejudice the quotations in the Christian chronographers <sup>161</sup>) we shall see this at once and in consequence give up any illusions as to their accuracy: when they occur in Eusebios they have already passed through many hands, and if we also (or only) find them in the books of Renaissance scholars, as for instance in Boccaccio's *Genealogia Deorum Gentilium* <sup>162</sup>) or in the *Mythologia* of Natale Conti <sup>163</sup>), they have in the best possible case the value of the *ἱστορίαι* in the Scholia on Homer, *i.e.* they make it appear probable, or at least possible, that Ph. mentioned the facts or persons concerned. The diligent and deserving book by Carlo Landi, *Demogorgone*, Palermo 1930 <sup>164</sup>), has shown the way in which such quotations may have come down to these authors, and he has even in some degree endowed with life one of the intermediators <sup>165</sup>), *viz.* Theodontius, whom he assigns to the ninth century A.D. <sup>166</sup>). But his wish concerning Theodontius' quo-

tations of Ph.<sup>167</sup>) I have been able to fulfil only so far as the greater part of them already occurs in Eusebios, and some even in Plutarch. Landi has immensely overestimated their value, also he has not convinced me of the *bona fides* of Natale Conti<sup>168</sup>. I hope he has not convinced others, for to put Fulgentius on the same level with authors whose learned sources and whose own learning are beyond doubt is as mistaken<sup>169</sup>) as the idea that Theodontius as well as Servius Danielis and the patriarch Photios still had access to the books of Ph.<sup>170</sup>.

In view of the impossibility of writing here a history of the tradition of Hellenistic Learning, I confine myself to giving a list of the titles of Ph.'s books with the evidence for them and the number of the fragments quoted from them by name. The last column of the list with the number of fragments to be assigned hypothetically to the respective works should be used with the utmost caution: we rarely arrive at certainty even in regard to seemingly verbatim fragments, because even they often are greatly abridged, and because the subjects of some books are so closely related that a number of possibilities remains open<sup>171</sup>). The figures, which, of course, must be considered also in the light of the length of each work represent merely approximate values<sup>172</sup>) (see schedule on p. 242).

The date of composition of none of these works has come down to us, and we cannot infer it for any of them with the exception of the *Atthis*<sup>173</sup>). The date we arrive at for this work makes it appear more than merely probable that by far the greater portion of the special works, if not all, had been written when Ph. (in the early 'eighties?) turned to the great new task. Our conception of Ph. as the first scholar among the Atthidographers (a matter of vital importance for our opinion of him) would become a certainty if he actually did special research work in different spheres for several decades before he became the historian of his native town. Down to the second half of his life he was what later one would have called a *γραμματικός*<sup>174</sup>) and what we should call a scholar, for even the books which may have had connexion of whatever kind with his official position as a *mantis* cannot, according to the titles and the fragments, have been written out of a purely religious interest or for practical use. Also the books concerned with history of literature or with interpretations, and the collective works on some other subjects, are so many and so voluminous that they can hardly be understood as the produce of the old age of a religious official who had resigned his office—supposing a *mantis* did go into retirement at all. On the contrary, everything seems

Title of work	Number of books	Testimonies	Number of fragments with a title	Presumably to be assigned
1. Atthis .....	17	I; 4-5; 8	74	102
5 2. [Ἐπιτομή τῆς ἰδίας Ἀθίδος] .....	?	I; 8	—	—
3. Πρὸς τὴν Δήμονος Ἀθίδα .....	?	I	I	—
10 4. Περὶ τῶν Ἀθήνησι ἀρξάντων .....	?	I	—	—
5. Ὀλυμπιάδες .....	2	I	—	—
6. Περὶ τῆς Τετραπόλεως .....	?	I	3	I (?)
7. Σαλαμίνος κτίσις .....	<I?>	I	—	—
8. Δηλιακά .....	2	I	—	—
15 9. Περὶ μαντικῆς .....	4	I; 6 (?)	4	6
10. Περὶ θυσιῶν .....	I	I	I (3)	2
11. Περὶ ἑορτῶν .....	<I>	—	2	2
12. Περὶ ἡμερῶν .....	more than I	—	4	2
13. Πρὸς Ἀλυπον ἐπιστολή .....	<I?>	—	I	—
20 14. Περὶ τῶν Ἀθ. ἀγώνων .....	[I?]	I	—	I (?)
15. Ἐπιτομή τῆς Διονυσίου πραγματείας Π. ἱερῶν .....	?	I	—	—
16. Περὶ μυστηρίων τῶν Ἀθήνησι .....	?	I	—	—
25 17. Περὶ καθαρμῶν .....	?	I	—	—
18. <Περὶ ὄνειρων> .....	?	7	—	I
19. Ἐπιγράμματα Ἀττικά .....	?	I	—	—
20. Περὶ τραγωιδιῶν σύγγραμμα .....	<I?>	—	I	I
30 21. Περὶ τῶν Σοφοκλέους μύθων .....	5	I	—	—
22. Περὶ Εὐριπίδου .....	<I?>	I	—	5
23. Πρὸς Ἀσκληπιάδην ἐπιστολή .....	<I?>	—	I	I
35 24. Περὶ Ἀλκμᾶνος .....	<I?>	I	—	3
25. Συναγωγή Ἡρωίδων ἤτοι Πυθαγορείων γυναικῶν .....	?	I	—	—
26. Περὶ συμβόλων .....	?	I	—	—
27. Περὶ Εὐρημάτων .....	?	I	—	4

to indicate that the leisure left to Ph. by his office in the last twenty or thirty years of his life was devoted to the *Atthis*. We have two certain dates for this work: (1) according to F 47/8 the sixth book contained a digression on the sacred ships of Athens, which cannot but belong to the capture of the *Paralos* by Philip, an event of 351 B.C. at the latest <sup>175</sup>). As this digression mentions the phylai Demetrias and Antigonis, it cannot have been written before 307/6 (306/5) B.C. (2) The ninth book, which treats the year 306/5 B.C. (i.e. contemporary history) was according to F 67 not composed before 292/1 B.C., a considerable time <sup>176</sup>) after the event <sup>176</sup>). We cannot escape these facts by groundless assumptions of second editions, later additions, and the like; the facts contradict the idea of Boeckh <sup>177</sup>), which has almost become a dogma, that the first six books 'may have been written and published much earlier than the following ones'. One may regard books 1-6 as a unity, <sup>15</sup> being the first part of the *Atthis* and substantially a re-casting of Androtion's work <sup>178</sup>) on which Ph. possibly did not spend much time, the less if the special books embodying the results of his research preceded them, and if the chief value of the re-casting consisted in the use made of these results. It is also conceivable that the first books were <sup>20</sup> published together, although this cannot be proved either for books 1-6 or for books 7-9. But the date gained for the composition of book 6 removes the foundation of the hypothesis. Further, the sixth book extended beyond the end of Androtion's *Atthis* <sup>179</sup>), and therefore not books 1-6, but the whole work was conceived as a unity; and the date ascertained for the <sup>25</sup> ninth book makes it appear probable that the final decision to write the work was not reached before the nineties of the third century. Perhaps even later: the revolt of Athens at the end of the year 289/8 B.C. <sup>180</sup>), the alliance with Ptolemy, and the fact that Demetrios gave Athens up in his treaty with Ptolemy, events which open a quarter of a century <sup>30</sup> of Athenian independence, may have been the incentive. The statement that the *Atthis* as a whole was directed against Demon supports the view suggested, even if it is not a proof. In any case, the note in the *Vita* (T 1) ἔστι δὲ πρὸς Δήμωνα, as credible in itself as analogous notes e.g. about some works in the *Life* of Charon of Lampsakos <sup>181</sup>), <sup>35</sup> was surely taken from the preface: following the example of Thukydidēs Ph. may have discussed in it his views in regard to the tradition and the treatment of it by earlier writers <sup>182</sup>). The criticism of Demon's work (which may have appeared about 300 B.C. <sup>183</sup>)) in a special paper Πρὸς τὴν Δήμωνος Ἀθιδά <sup>184</sup>) or Πρὸς Δήμωνα ἀντιγραφὴ <sup>185</sup>), of course,

preceded Ph.s own work. We have but one quotation from this polemical book, but it occurs in Harpokration, who quotes the *Atthis* elsewhere, and it is therefore sufficient to render impossible the identification of the book against Demon with Ph.s own *Atthis* or some section of it <sup>186</sup>.

5 The special book or pamphlet (cf. no. 13; 23 of the schedule) was manifestly called forth at once by the appearance of Demon's *Atthis*, and such a polemical book is quite in accordance both with those scholarly times and with Ph.s own capacity as a scholar in the domain of Athenian antiquities. Moreover, ἀντιγραφή and Ἀτθίς are entirely different types of learned  
10 work. There may have been an interval of a decade or more between the criticism of Demon's *Atthis* and the publication of the first books of his own great work, which kept him occupied during the 'eighties and the 'seventies, and was not yet finished when he died in 263/2 B.C. <sup>187</sup>.

The *Atthis* can be placed in the history of Atthidography (1) by its  
15 close connexion with the *Atthis* of Androtion, the purpose of which was determined by its author's great interest in foreign policy, and which consequently was not extremely democratic in its bias (one had better formulate thus negatively). This connexion has been noticed already in antiquity as is shown by numerous quotations mentioning Ph. and  
20 Androtion alongside of each other as the best witnesses, or as those agreeing on some special point <sup>188</sup>. (2) by Ph.s attitude towards the latest *Atthis*, that of Demon. Of this attitude we have evidence <sup>189</sup> though unfortunately we are not able to discover particulars <sup>190</sup>, for Demon was perhaps more effectually superseded by the work of Ph.  
25 himself than Kleidemos, the earliest Atthidographer, or Phanodemos, whose immoderate panegyrics may have kept him in use. (3) by the fact that in the course of the general development the series of local chronicles written by Athenians comes to an end with Ph. In the very  
30 next generation a disciple of Kallimachos, Istros, summarized them in a purely collective work, while the literature about matters of cult, cultivated essentially if not exclusively by Athenians, and partly at least purely antiquarian, not only continues but grows in bulk, periegeseis and other special types of antiquarian character being added (cf. *Atthis* p. 107 ff.).

This last *Atthis* naturally opened (according to the nature of the local  
35 Chronicle) with primeval history <sup>191</sup>, and in 17 books it led down to the time of its author, whom death overtook with the pen still in his hand <sup>192</sup>. From the statement about its contents—περιέχει δὲ τὰς Ἀθηναίων πράξεις καὶ βασιλεῖς καὶ ἄρχοντας ἕως Ἀντιόχου τοῦ † τελευταίου τοῦ προσαγορευθέντος Θεοῦ one might infer on the one hand that the work was cut



short in the middle of an Attic year, as otherwise it would have been obvious to give the archon of the concluding year <sup>193</sup>); on the other hand that in the last sentences a Syrian king Antiochos was mentioned, for the biographical sources of the Suda date by the Ptolemies, not by the Seleucids. Unfortunately the corruption in the last words cannot be corrected with certainty: Ph. cannot at that time have called the third Seleucid king Θεός; the qualification must be assumed to derive from the chronographic, or rather from the biographical, source of the Suda. But τοῦ προσαγορευθέντος Θεοῦ may quite well be one of the unexplained wrong additions that occur in the Suda <sup>194</sup>), and the correct distinctive epithet which Ph. supplied may be contained in τελευταίου; it might for instance be corrupted from Σελεύκου υἱοῦ. We therefore cannot decide whether the second or the third Seleucid is meant; and if it is the latter, whether he was already sole ruler at that time (which he was from 261/0 B.C. <sup>195</sup>), or whether he was co-regent of Antiochos Soter: the cuneiform documents prove him to have held this position from 264 B.C. at the latest <sup>196</sup>). The concluding year of the Chronicle—262/1 B.C. in the general opinion—remains just as uncertain as that of the death of the Chronicler <sup>197</sup>). But the hypothesis that Antiochos II showed the Athenians proofs of his goodwill when he was still co-regent and during the time of the Chremonidean War, is perhaps slightly more likely than the other, *viz.* that Ph. reported the coalition against Ptolemy concluded by Antiochos and Antigonos perhaps in 260 B.C. In both cases the report of Ph. followed close upon the heels of events, a thing not at all impossible in itself: we should only have to assume that the last book of the *Atthis* (like the eighth book of Thukydides, and according to common ancient usage) was published as it was found, not provided with an emergency roof like the one Demophilos built for the Histories of his father Ephoros <sup>198</sup>), where the arrangement in greater sections of matter seemed to require such a proceeding.

The preceding discussion rests on the presumption that Ph. did not give up his principle of arranging the material annalistically even where his account became very detailed, *i.e.* in the books 9 (7) to 17. This, in my opinion, is not a hypothesis, it is self-evident: the nature of the chronicle requires this arrangement; it can be shown already in the *Atthis* of Hellanikos, and Ph. himself furnishes the greatest and the best part of the evidence <sup>199</sup>). The analogy of Roman historiography, which also has one town as its centre, shows at least that even the most detailed account of events concerning this town directly or indirectly does not

compel its author to abandon the annalistic principle. It was improbable from the first when Boeckh <sup>200</sup>) stated that 'one could not be certain of the last books having been arranged always according to archons' and that 'altogether one was justified in assuming an arrangement according to time only for the greater part of the work'. Recent authors <sup>201</sup>), who occasionally put forward the same contention in regard to the earlier books, have not been aware of the consequences: the assumption that Ph. *e.g.* in the opening of the fifth book 'interrupted the arrangement by years', treating the history of Konon's naval war during the years 397/6-394/3 B.C. continuously under one archon for the convenience of the reader, would mean no less and no more than complete abandonment of the form. Such a consequence would show the absurdity of the assumption even if it were supported by some better evidence than an extract of Didymos in his commentary on Demosthenes <sup>202</sup>). Even the conjecture, more moderate and not impossible in itself, that 'the later books occasionally have woven into them supplements to the former' and that 'the tenth book in particular contained supplements to the fifth' <sup>203</sup>) cannot be raised to certainty: I prefer the slight alteration of δεκάτη to ἑκταή <sup>204</sup>) in the only passage which serves as its support. Anyhow, supplements like these would not abolish, or even essentially impair, the principle of the arrangement; even less do the systematic digressions, which we really may assume with some certainty. They seem to have been rather frequent, and the chronicler either looks back in them or anticipates <sup>205</sup>): an anticipation is certain *e.g.* when in F 47-48 from the sixth book, probably in the year 352/1 B.C., enumerating the 'Sacred Ships', Ph. mentions not only the *Ammonias* and the *Paralos*, but also the *Demetrias* and the *Antigonis* which cannot be older than 307/6 (308/7) B.C. In such cases a simple ὕστερον was sufficient for calling the attention of the reader to the fact that the chronicler is anticipating: this ὕστερον has been preserved in the verbatim fragments 30 and 66 <sup>206</sup>). But also in F 48, not a verbatim quotation, the words πρώτας and προσγενομένας show that the systematic digression does not disregard chronology; and, moreover, in this particular case we shall not doubt that the creation of the new ships was mentioned again *suo anno, i.e.* in the context of the honours which liberated Athens decided to confer on her saviours at the end of 308/7 and early in 307/6 B.C. <sup>207</sup>). The same applies to the retrospective digressions which were, perhaps, more frequent. In regard to these one should take into account as a difference from the anticipatory ones, that Ph. may sometimes not have

been able accurately to date the earlier stages, or that he did not care to do so. The former may for instance be the case in the digression about the strength and the organization of the Athenian army, which, following Thukydides, he probably gave under the year 432/1 B.C. <sup>208</sup>). The latter may apply to the fate of Nikaia F 56 (where one should, however, pay attention to the fact that by the words δτ' ἐκεῖνος ἦν ἐν Σκύθαις Ph. does indicate the time), or to the phases of the quarrel between Thasos and Maroneia about Stryme (where the digression went back to the sixth century <sup>209</sup>), or to the innovations in music F 23, where Ph. attached his account to the mention of a Sikyonian κισαριστής, who possibly had made his appearance in Athens. Retrospective digressions back to mythic times were natural in the list of the demes <sup>210</sup>): here although the connexion with Kleisthenes and the year 508/7 B.C. was given, a dating of the mythical eponymous heroes or facts was not always possible, or perhaps would have led too far into mythical history <sup>211</sup>). In other cases one may explain this going back (if my conception of F 35 and F 168 is correct) by the fact that Ph. in his account of Solon's constitution neither enumerated all laws, nor embodied the Athenian calendar of festivals in the *Atthis*, but mentioned 'Solonian' laws or festivals when it seemed necessary and when there was an opportunity. There are other cases where we cannot see clearly: in F 30 of the third book about ostracism an anticipatory history of the institution down to its end would be possible; but the authorship of Ph. is certain only for the description of the proceedings; even if the historical statements about Hyperbolos also derive from his *Atthis*, the ostracism of this man may have (again?) been mentioned in the fourth book under the year 418/7 B.C. The converse may apply to F 64: Ph. dealt with the νομοφύλακες of Demetrios of Phaleron in the seventh book, but mentioned their introduction in 462/1 B.C. which belongs to the third book <sup>212</sup>). Also in F 33 about the θεωρικόν (where the number of the book is subject to doubt <sup>213</sup>) πρῶτον shows that Ph. retrospectively summarized the history of the institution, or at least called the attention of the reader to the fact that it had a history. Because of the state of our tradition the existence of such digressions occasionally leads to doubts in regard to the correct placing of a quotation which has come down to us without the number of a book. Apart from that, this discussion was necessary solely because of modern misunderstandings and wrong inferences from the several fragments mentioned. The fact that Ph.'s *Atthis*, like all other *Atthides*, was arranged by archons' years is self-evident and not in need of proof.

Returning to the main course of our discussion I shall state what can be ascertained about the general scheme of Ph.'s *Atthis*. It is less than might be expected judging from the relatively great number of fragments. But the fact that we are astonishingly ill-informed about the distribution of the material is as certain as its explanation is simple. Of the 71 fragments which bear the number of a book not less than 61 derive from book I-VI which carried the story down to 339/8 B.C. at the least <sup>214</sup>) and probably covered two more decads until 319/8 B.C. <sup>215</sup>). There is the same relation in regard to the datable pieces without the number of a book which can confidently be assigned to the *Atthis* <sup>216</sup>): of 76 fragments 71 belong to the period ending 339/8, and 73 to that ending 319/8. Of these 134 pieces (61 with the number of a book and 73 without) which concern the period ending 319/8 B.C., again more than half (*viz.* 75) refer to the 140 years from 460/59 to 319/8 B.C. <sup>217</sup>). The reason obviously is that our tradition derives almost exclusively from the grammarians who interpreted the 'classic' authors; further that the Scholia on Aristophanes contain far more learned material than those on Aischylos and Sophokles, the Scholia on Euripides and the Orators standing midway between them. Thus it is to be explained on the one hand that out of the more than six centuries which according to common chronology lie between the synoecism of Theseus and the legislation of Solon, not one item of historical information has been preserved—that period being outside the sphere of interest of both Tragedy and political speech—; and on the other hand (which is even more important) that from the eleven contemporary books VII-XVII we only possess 13 fragments <sup>218</sup>). Of these 13 four come from the seventh book <sup>219</sup>), which contained the legislation of Demetrios of Phaleron, and only one from the time after the battle of Ipsos <sup>220</sup>). Possibly the relative figures would be slightly different if Scholia on the New Comedy existed; as things are, the facts are a highly illuminating example of the nature of our tradition about Hellenistic Athens and her history <sup>221</sup>). Whoever was interested in that time consulted the books on general history written by Diyllos and Hieronymos, Duris and Phylarchos, Demochares and others, among the authors of which some (though few) were Athenians. It is very doubtful whether of the universal historians of Roman times anyone utilized the wealth of local (and not solely local) information contained in the contemporary books of Ph. The epitome made of the *Atthis* in Pompey's time <sup>222</sup>) and never quoted by scholars is no more than a shadow for us: no doubt its author had at his disposal the books VII-XVIII, but it is quite uncertain whether a

handbook, presumably intended for the use of the Romans studying in Athens or making 'the grand tour' to the East, bestowed more than a perfunctory glance on the post-classic period, such as is given to it by the *Periegesis* of that time <sup>223</sup>) or by Pausanias.

5 The investigations in *Atthis* p. III ff. into the attitude of the several Atthidographers towards prehistory ('archaeology'), historical period, and history of their own time ended in the result that Ph. and Androtion form a group by themselves, because they treat the 'archaeology' rather succinctly, the historical time fully, and the contemporary history in  
 10 great detail. Thus in their dealings with the material they move away from the essentially antiquarian chronicle in the direction of the methods of Universal History. The close connexion between these two Atthidographers <sup>224</sup>) is generally corroborated by abundant double quotations especially, but not solely, in regard to historical facts; and the accidental  
 15 preservation of both their accounts of the conflict with Megara in 350/49 B.C. <sup>225</sup>), which agree almost verbatim, justifies the conclusion that Ph. made the *Atthis* of Androtion, as far as it went, the basis of his own work <sup>226</sup>). The first part of it presents itself as a kind of re-casting of his predecessor, whom he obviously estimated highly. In these cir-  
 20 cumstances it is not surprising that books I-VI, forming in a certain degree a unity as to Ph.'s conception of the development of Athenian history, deal with about 1250 years, whereas the second part consisting of the eleven books VII to XVII treats at the utmost 75 years, probably only 55, which means that Ph. in his account of contemporary history  
 25 gave a whole book to five years on the average. But it does surprise us, at least at the first blush, that the preceding period until 346/5 B.C. or a little later (344/3) <sup>227</sup>), with which Androtion filled eight books, was despatched in five by Ph., for his sixth book certainly extended down to 339/8 B.C., and probably included also the time of Alexander, the first  
 30 years of the Diadochs, the Lamian War, and its consequences for Athens. This fact in my opinion allows of an inference as to the nature of Ph.'s re-casting. Since he used four books as against Androtion's three for the time from Kekrops until (probably) the end of the Peloponnesian War, he cannot simply have abridged the account of his predecessor, nor can  
 35 an explanation be found in the fact that Ph. had already treated the antiquities, which might naturally require more room in the first books than in the contemporary history, in a number of special works <sup>228</sup>). The fragments themselves forbid an explanation of this kind: they show distinctly (this is not merely a conclusion *e silentio*) that the

interest of Androtion, who was a politician not a scholar, in matters of pre-history and antiquities was small, not only relatively but absolutely; they show on the other hand that Ph., for all his special works, treated in detail in the *Atthis*<sup>229</sup>) at least the more important cults and festivals.

5 Consequently we have to conclude that the work Ph. did on the basis of Androtion's *Atthis* really involved a re-casting. He took from his predecessor the skeleton of facts, historical and constitutional, which he believed Androtion to have supplied sufficiently on the whole and presented in a way which accorded with Ph.s own moderately conser-

10 vative standpoint; therefore in these things he followed him, for some passages in the very wording. But he clothed the skeleton and enlarged the historical account with the abundance of material provided by his far wider range of interests, which were by no means confined to religion and cult. Perhaps we may suppose that at least for the historical period

15 the re-casting consisted mainly of such supplementing, and that the systematic digressions which interrupt the brief annual entries belong to this supplementing procedure. Evidently they were more numerous and more varied as to their contents in Ph. than in Androtion: we find digressions concerned with theology, as *e.g.* that about Dionysos<sup>230</sup>;

20 others dealing with constitutional law as *e.g.* that about the conception of Attic citizenship and earlier cultic-political associations which existed in the State<sup>231</sup>), and again purely factual ones as *e.g.* the passage about the organization of the Attic army<sup>232</sup>). It is possible that the great attention paid to buildings, to works of art, to dedications<sup>233</sup>), and the

25 verbatim quotations of early and recent inscriptions<sup>234</sup>), belong to the contribution of Ph. We have been trying above to appreciate the outcome of this his work.

Concerning the distribution of the material among the individual books (or pairs of books, for one almost has the impression that two

30 books constitute the unit for Ph.), we do not get much beyond the excellent investigation of Boeckh who established everything attainable (and possibly something more), and whose results have mostly been simply adopted by later authors who have treated them as facts<sup>235</sup>). Boeckh, it is true, did not follow his own principles quite strictly when

35 opening his investigations by speculations on F 182 and F 94. If we keep to the fragments which have come down with the number of a book (as we ought) we have to face the unpleasant fact that of not one single book we can state the chronological limits with certainty. We are dependent on considerations of probability and cannot avoid working

with years epochal in our opinion, not always knowing whether these years were epochal in Ph.'s view too, or whether he attached any importance to the historical unity of each single book: a chronicle did not absolutely demand this <sup>236</sup>). Although for instance it is certain that books I-II treated the 'Archaeology' (to use this somewhat neutral term), it is not certain whether the first book was wholly given to the general introduction, the chronicle proper beginning in the second book with the account of the individual reigns <sup>237</sup>). And it is still more regrettable that we cannot even conjecturally determine the lower limit of the double-book because we have no quotation with the number of a book for the c. 650 years between Theseus (F 17-19) and Solon (F 20-21) <sup>238</sup>). Was the 'Archaeology' confined to the period of the kings in the narrower sense, or did it include the ἀρχοντες διὰ βίου and the δεκαετείς? Did the historical time in the third book open with the first annual archon in 683/2 B.C. or with the archonship of Solon in 594/3? Even in the former case (to mention this in passing) Ph. treated the 'Archaeology' more fully than Kleidemos <sup>239</sup>) or Androtion whose second book certainly extended down to Kleisthenes <sup>240</sup>), and it only remains uncertain whether the kings had the benefit of the greater fullness in this first section of the *Atthis*, or whether the greater extent is due to the fact that Ph. dedicated a whole book to a detailed and systematic description of primeval times. In any case, the fragments show that cults and festivals claimed a good deal of room in these books. The third book almost certainly contained the legislation of Solon <sup>241</sup>) and quite certainly the reform by Kleisthenes <sup>242</sup>) which evidently took more room than that of Solon described only in its fundamental features <sup>243</sup>). But the book certainly extended far into the fifth century: F 32 refers to the consequences of the great earthquake in Sparta in 464/3 B.C.; and if F 117 (which unfortunately has come down without a number) records the Spartan request for aid in Athens and denotes τὰς κατεχούσας τὴν Λακεδαιμόνα συμφορὰς as being epochal for the beginning of Athenian 'hegemony', we shall be justified in assuming that this was the end of the third or the opening of the fourth book <sup>244</sup>). There seems to me to be hardly a doubt that Boeckh was correct in assuming the borderline of the two books to be the year of the reform of the Areiopagos in 462/1 B.C., a date which would be even more suitable if the book opened with the archonship of Solon <sup>245</sup>). In any case, this first 'historical' book included at least 130 years, and if it began with the first archon even 220. Of the fourth book the only certain dates are the years 448/7 and 437/6

B.C. <sup>246</sup>); but F 35 in all probability belongs to the year 451/0, and F 37 to the last years before the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War. Unfortunately not one of the many fragments from the history of the war <sup>247</sup>) has come down to us with the number of its book. But if we may place

5 F 38-39 in the year 432/1 B.C. (and Ph.s following of Thukydidēs elsewhere recognizable strongly favours this suggestion) the conclusion becomes inevitable that book IV recorded the whole war and concluded with the year 404/3 B.C. It would thus contain the history of the 'hegemony' of Athens and its break-down, an acceptable historical unity.

10 Even then Ph.s account of the 60 years or so of this important period is rather succinct, particularly if we are correct in assuming here a number of systematic digressions; nor do the fragments contradict the suggestion that the fourth book still entirely kept the brief style of a chronicle with the exception of these digressions. The fifth book then began

15 with the restitution of democracy and the year of reforms under Eukleidēs in 403/2 B.C.; this certainly was epochal in the view of Ph. too as to Aristotle and as to us. We can date most quotations from this book with certainty: the beginning of the rebuilding of the walls F 40 in 395/4 B.C.; the financial reform F 41 in 378/7; the events in Thrace

20 F 42/3 in 362/1 and 361/0 B.C. Regrettably F 44 from the fifth and F 45/6 from the sixth book make difficulties; the latter not because of the reference to the law of Periander and the introduction of the trierarchic symmories, but because the year cannot be determined quite certainly, although 358/7 B.C. is more probable than 357/6; F 44 because

25 357/6 is not wholly impossible although 360/59 is far more probable. It therefore remains an open question whether the fifth book came to an end with the Attic year 360/59 B.C., in which Philip of Macedon ascended the throne, or whether the sixth book opened with the outbreak of the Social War in 357/6, though the former alternative has the greater

30 probability <sup>248</sup>). Of the further fragments from book VI F 45-48 cannot be dated accurately to the year, but they belong to the fifties of the fourth century; F 49-51 refer to the struggle for Olynthos in 349/8, F 52 to the revision of the Citizens' List in 346/5, F 53-56 to the opening of the war against Philip in 340/39 and 339/8 B.C. The historians who deny

35 the epochal importance of the battle of Chaironeia will be pleased to learn that Ph. did not conclude a book with this event: F 59, probably from 338/7 B.C., does not help in this respect, but F 57 <sup>249</sup>) certainly belongs to the time of the administration of Lykurgos 338/7-327/6 B.C., the whole of which therefore probably was recorded in the sixth book.



Boeckh<sup>250</sup>) suggested fixing the inferior limit of this book at 319/8 B.C. on account of the special book *Περὶ τῶν Ἀθηνῶν ἀρχόντων ἀπὸ Σωκρατίδου καὶ μέχρι Ἀπολλοδώρου*. We know nothing about the purpose and the contents of this book, and Boeckh's hypothesis has an altogether weak foundation because the year of Sokratides 374/3 B.C. occurs in the middle of the fifth book, and because there are two archons of the name Apollodoros, one in 350/49 and the other in 319/8 B.C. If the administration of Lykurgos was recorded in the sixth book and that of Demetrios of Phaleron (F 63/5) in the seventh, there can hardly be any doubt that for Ph. Athens' loss of independence made an epoch. Only as the stronghold Phyle must have been mentioned repeatedly during these years, we cannot definitely decide whether the occupation of the Peiraieus by the Macedonians after the Lamian War in 322/1 B.C. or the surrender of Athens to Kassander in 318/7 B.C.<sup>251</sup>) marked the end of the sixth book, though perhaps the second alternative offers a slightly greater probability. This book might *a priori* be inscribed 'The Struggle for Autonomy'. With book VII begins the contemporary history proper, and the fullness of the account as compared with books I-VI at once bounds upwards. Unfortunately we know next to nothing about the arrangement of these eleven contemporary books. If the year 306/5 B.C. occurred in the ninth book as the first of liberated Athens—it is a big if<sup>252</sup>)—and the deliverance itself in the eighth (F 66), one might suggest (remembering the almost certain boundary line between books IV-V) that the two books VII and VIII contained the period of the Macedonian occupation starting either from the Lamian War or from the introduction of the epimeletes by Kassander. F 69-70 from the tenth book I place with some doubt in the year 302/1 B.C.: it seems quite conceivable that 306/5-303/2 B.C., years eventful also in regard to home policy, should have filled a whole book. Of the books XI-XVII we have only one quotation, and that is undatable.

A survey of the results obtained for the arrangement of the *Atthis* may be useful:

Books I-II	Primeval times (Kekrops) down to the first annual archon 683/2 B.C. or the year before Solon's legislation
35	595/4 ..... c. 900-1000 years
Book III	From Kreon in 683/2 B.C. or Solon in 594/3 down to the taking over of the hegemony by Athens and(?) the

	reform of the constitution by Ephialtes in 462/1 B.C. ....	c. 220 or c. 130 years	
Book IV	History of the hegemony of Athens until its breakdown (The Rise and Fall of the Athenian Empire) 462/1-		
5	404/3 .....	c. 60 years	
Book V	From the end of the Peloponnesian War 403/2 B.C. to the accession of Philip of Macedon in 360/59 (or the Social War 357/6) .....	44 (47) years	
10	Book VI	The war with Macedonia and the struggle for the liberty of Athens from 359/8(?) B.C. to the occupation of the Peiraieus in 322/1 or the establishment of Demetrios of Phaleron 318/7 B.C. ....	(36-)42 years
15	Books VII-VIII	Macedonian rule from 321/0 (317/6) to the first deliverance by Demetrios Poliorketes in 307/6 B.C. ....	(11-)15 years
20	Book IX	The leadership of Stratokles and the Four Years' War(?) 306/5-303/2 B.C. ....	4 (?) years
	Books X-XVII	From 302/1 (?) to the loss of liberty (Chremonidean War) in 262/1(?) B.C. ....	c. 40 years
25			

This survey as a whole seems to justify my opinion that Ph. treated his material as a true historian<sup>253</sup>): the single or double book did not contain an indefinite number of years but a definite period of Athenian history. On the other hand there remain so many uncertainties, even though the margin of doubt is in most cases no more than a few years, that I could not take the responsibility of assigning to individual books all fragments with historical contents that have come down without the number of a book. I rested content with inserting references to the datable facts between the fragments transmitted with the number of a book, reconciling myself to the slight degree of uncertainty about the boundary lines between the books. All other fragments, even if they are quoted from the *Atthis* (as some few are) or if they can be derived from it with a greater or lesser degree of probability, I arranged into groups according to their subject-matter.

About Ph. as a stylist we must confess that we are as little able to reach a judgement as on the other Atthidographers<sup>256</sup>) although the number of verbatim fragments (or those appearing to be verbatim, a distinction which it is well to observe<sup>257</sup>) is not quite small<sup>258</sup>), and although at least some of them are not quite brief. But, of course, they derive almost entirely not only from the 'chronicle' books but even from the 'chronicly' portions of those books. They show the succinct style of the chronicle and the carefully cultivated language of the scholar and the Athenian without particular claims to style (the hiatus is never avoided) and without rhetorical tricks; these would not be suitable for the subject-matter with the presentation of which Ph. is solely concerned. His mode of expression is often deliberately formal, but always absolutely simple and absolutely clear<sup>257</sup>). It remains, however, completely unknown how he wrote in the digressions and especially in the 'historical' books, meaning the greater part of the *Atthis* describing the events of his own time. Fragments of these are missing altogether, and there is no ancient appreciation to fill the gap, T 4 not being concerned with style, at least not primarily. I do not think, however, that his style changed essentially in these passages. The simple fact that these books contained speeches— if I have interpreted F 69/70 correctly—is of no great account; more important is the other fact that Ph. is not once quoted because of a 'gloss'<sup>258</sup>) or a figure of style. It may be inferred that the style and the language of these books also had no artificial and certainly no sensational features.

25

## T(ESTIMONIES)

(1) Κύκνου] According to Wilamowitz *Herm.* 20, 1885, p. 631 this is the Κύκνος Φιλοχόρου 'Αναφλύστιος, named in the catalogue of the prytaneis of the Antiochis in 334/3 B.C.<sup>1</sup>) and honoured with special mention by the βουλή and the φυλέται at the end of the catalogue together with an 'Ερατόστρατος Ναυσικύδου 'Αναφλύστιος. In that case the Δημήτριος Κύκνου 'Αναφλύστιος mentioned on a basis from the end of the fourth century B.C., found at the Peiraeus<sup>2</sup>), is probably the brother of the Atthidographer. The Φιλόχορος Δημονίκου, who about 390 B.C. married Aristomache, daughter of Kleidemides, sister of Kleidemos, from a distinguished family of Melite<sup>3</sup>) is perhaps an ancestor. Thus the last Atthidographer and the earliest may have been distantly related. The names do not sound aristocratic, but Ph.s family, too, may have

been 'distinguished' <sup>4</sup>). μάντις καὶ ἱεροσκόπος] see on T 2.  
 'Ἐπιτομὴν τῆς ἰδίας Ἀτθίδος] The purpose of an epitome of his own *Atthis*  
 by Ph. is difficult to imagine, and it is even less intelligible why a grammarian in the period of Julius Caesar and Augustus <sup>5</sup>) should have repeated  
 5 the work done by Ph. himself. The difficulty is increased if the *Atthis* was, as appears to be the case, the work of his later years <sup>6</sup>) on which he was engaged to the end of his life. Everything favours the suggestion <sup>7</sup>) that the compiler of the list of books erroneously transferred the epitome of Pollio to Ph. himself. No proof is needed to show that towards the end  
 10 of the first century B.C. an epitome of the last and greatest *Atthis*, i.e. a short survey of the history of Athens, answered a need of the time, and a grammarian would be the proper man to meet it. We do not find the Epitome quoted anywhere: Didymos, of course, used the unabridged work, and so most probably did Dionysios of Halikarnassos, who, for  
 15 his purposes, only needed the (fifth and) sixth book(s) <sup>8</sup>). Moreover, it remains doubtful whether the Epitome had been published when Dionysios wrote about the Attic orators.

(2) The seeming contradiction between the *Vita* in which Ph. is called μάντις καὶ ἱεροσκόπος and Proklos who calls him and a second writer <sup>1</sup>)  
 20 ἐξηγητῆς τῶν πατρῶν νόμων cannot be solved by adding up the two statements and concluding that Ph. was both μάντις and ἐξηγητῆς <sup>2</sup>). As there is a widespread, or rather almost universal, confusion which treats μάντις and ἐξηγηταὶ practically as interchangeable expressions <sup>3</sup>) we shall have to deal with the problem in some detail. In the first place there is  
 25 no doubt that of the two witnesses the well-informed biographer is more worthy of our confidence; we may assume that he handed down the official position of Ph. correctly, although we cannot, of course, disprove the suggestion of a gap in his statements. On the other hand, it is uncertain whether Proklos intends at all to state the official position of his  
 30 two writers, or whether he is merely characterizing the purpose of their literary activity <sup>4</sup>). What he quotes from Ph. is taken from the work entitled Περὶ ἡμερῶν <sup>5</sup>), not from an Ἐξηγητικόν; and the terms ἐξηγητῆς and ἐξηγεῖσθαι in themselves are ambiguous. Leaving aside non-religious meanings as guide, teacher, interpreter <sup>6</sup>), the Scholiasts (and not the  
 35 Scholiasts alone) use the words with reference to μάντις, other kinds of diviners and priests <sup>7</sup>). Even in the interpretations of the Lexicographers ἐξηγητῆς does not always denote a member of one of the three Athenian colleges of exegetai; inside and outside of Athenian literature it is used in the wider sense of 'expounder, interpreter', in Pausanias (and again he

is not alone) in the sense of *περιηγητής*. There is no doubt about these facts, and it will be sufficient to quote two passages, one for the verb and one for the noun, the latter being (through no fault of the ancient grammarian) the starting-point for modern attempts at obliterating the distinction between exegetes and mantis: (1) Schol. Aristoph. *Ρακ* 1031 ὁ Στιλβίδης . . . περιβόητος μάντις τῶν τοῦς παλαιούς χρησμούς ἐξηγουμένων<sup>9</sup>). This Stilbides was the favourite mantis of Nikias; his official position is perfectly clear, and he is called μάντις by Philochoros F 135. (2) *Antiattikista* p. 98, 18 Bkr<sup>9</sup>) ἐξηγητής· Εὐπολις Χρυσῶι Γένει (I 338, 297 K) »Λάμπων οὐξηγητής»<sup>10</sup>)· μάντις γάρ ἦν καὶ χρησμούς ἐξηγεῖτο· Ἡρόδοτος † τετάρτωι. The second quotation refers either to Hdt. I, 78, 2 αὐτίκα δὲ ἐπεμπε (*scil.* ὁ Κροῖσος) θεοπρόπους ἐς τῶν ἐξηγητῶν Τελμησσέων, or to 3, 31, 3 οἱ δὲ βασιλῆιοι δικασταὶ . . . τοῖσι Πέρσησι δικας δικάζουσι καὶ ἐξηγηταὶ τῶν πατρῶν θεσμῶν γίνονται. Again there is no doubt that Lampon was a μάντις<sup>11</sup>), and if Eupolis (and Eupolis alone) calls him ἐξηγητής one is immediately inclined to assume that he uses the term not in its technical, but in the wider sense<sup>12</sup>). Such at least is the opinion of the Scholiast on *Nub.* 332, who explains the *Θουριομάντις*: οὐ τοὺς ἀπὸ Θουρίου μάντις, ἀλλὰ τοὺς εἰς Θούριον, πόλιν Σικελίας, πεμφθέντας ἐπὶ τῶι κτίσει αὐτὴν· ἐπέμφθησαν δὲ δέκα ἄνδρες, ὧν καὶ Λάμπων ἦν ὁ μάντις, ὃν ἐξηγητὴν ἐκάλουν<sup>13</sup>). ἦν δὲ καὶ τῶν πολιτευομένων πολλάκις·<sup>14</sup>) λόγους δὲ συνεχῶς εἰσάγειν ἐφαίνετο περὶ τῆς εἰς Θούριον ἀποικίας. I do not see any reason for doubting the explanation which apparently derives from a good source (the *Κωμωιδούμενοι* for choice) dealing extensively with Lampon who was the favourite mantis of Perikles as Stilbides was of Nikias. Unfortunately we do not know whether he also accompanied him on his campaigns, e.g. in the Samian War. To leave no possibility unexplored, one might assume that Lampon at some later time was elected ἐξηγητής, and that it was for this reason that Eupolis in 425/4 B.C. called him so<sup>15</sup>). I do not know whether a mantis (probably manteis seldom were eupatrids<sup>16</sup>)) could be elected a member of one of the colleges of exegetai (the *πυθόχρηστοι* for choice); there is no evidence for the possibility, but this is not saying much as our evidence (especially with regard to the exegetai) is extremely slender. Even if the possibility existed the likelihood that the thing occurred is small: the Scholiast using (as he probably does) the *Κωμωιδούμενοι*, would have known about it, and his expression ὃν ἐξηγητὴν ἐκάλουν, referring (as it certainly does) to the line of Eupolis, shows that he had no other evidence available for the assumption that Lampon was an exegetes in the technical sense; he also knows that Lampon had received

the *σίτησις ἐν πρυτανείῳ*, but again this fact does not allow of the inference that he belonged to the exegetai, who, perhaps since the 'forties, enjoyed this privilege <sup>17</sup>).

As to Ph., it is only Proklos who mentions him as one of the *ἐξηγηταὶ τῶν πατρῶν ἄνδρες*. This need not mean that he held office as *ἐξηγητής*, and it probably does not, for the quotation (as I have already stated) does not derive from an exegetical book and is not concerned with facts relating to the duties of the exegetai or to their special knowledge. In fact, among Ph.'s numerous books about religious subjects there is no <sup>10</sup> *Ἐξηγητικόν*. This can hardly be accidental, for he wrote a work *Περὶ μαντικῆς* in four books which must be counted among his more important efforts <sup>18</sup>). Nor does it seem to be purely accidental that, when officially called upon to interpret an omen and narrating his expert interpretation in his *Atthis* (F 67), he introduces it with *ἐφαμεν*, not with *ἐξηγούμεθα*, <sup>15</sup> which would have been the proper term for a reply given by an *ἐξηγητής*, and is used as such for example by the exegetai whom the client of Demosthenes consulted and (according to the speaker of *Κατ' Ἀνδοκίδου*) by Perikles <sup>19</sup>). The probability that Ph. was an exegetes is practically *nil*; we are justified in assuming that there is no gap in the beginning of <sup>20</sup> the *Vita*, and that the biographer is to be trusted when he calls him *μάντις καὶ ἱεροσκόπος* <sup>20</sup>). There is, as far as I know, no documentary evidence of an official *ἱεροσκόπος* in Athens, nor does the term occur in Harpokration or in any other lexicographer, although Pollux 1, 15-19 <sup>21</sup>) gives a detailed account of the terms used for the several forms of <sup>25</sup> *μαντική*, among them that of the *χρησμολόγος*, which is the Scholiast's explanation for *μάντις*. Pollux further mentions in 7, 188 *τερασκόποι, τερασκοπική, τερατοσκοπία*; he also has a series of *manteis*, as e.g. *ἀλφειτομάντις, ἀστρομάντις, νυκτομάντις*; and there are other compounds with *-σκόπος* as their second part, as e.g. *ὄρνεοσκόποι* or *ὄρνιθοσκόποι*. Finally <sup>30</sup> there is *ἱερόπτης*, which Phrynichos <sup>22</sup>) explains by *ὁ τὰ ἱερά ἐποπτεύων καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν μαντευόμενος*. We have therefore to leave open the question what exactly the *ἱεροσκόπος* in Athens is, though Phrynichos' *ἱερόπτης* seems a good enough guide; and there is a book by Ph. himself which may very well refer to this part of the activity of a *mantis*, the *Ἐπιτομή <sup>35</sup> τῆς Διονυσίου πραγματείας Περὶ ἱερῶν* <sup>23</sup>). I submit that *ἱεροσκόπος* does not denote a special office but re-inforces the word *μάντις*, defining it, or specifying part of what it implies, in a certain direction <sup>24</sup>): there were *μαντευτὰ ἱερά* in Athens which the *ἱεροποιοί* offered with the assistance of *μάντις* <sup>25</sup>), and the *manteis* officiating with them may well have been

called *ἱεροσκόποι*. The word and its derivations are relatively rare also outside Athens, and the evidence is mostly late <sup>26</sup>), though Hekataios of Abdera (in the last decades of the fourth century B.C.) and Polybios use *ἱεροσκοπία* and *ἱεροσκοπεῖσθαι* <sup>27</sup>), and there is no doubt that *ἱεροσκόπος* was used for manteis and other officials who were concerned with prophecy from *σημεῖα*. As to the official rôle of the manteis in Athenian political life, it is a most important one if only because, differing in this from most of the priests and other cult-officials (as e.g. the *ἱεροποιοί* just mentioned), they held office for life. Their activity in the fifth century is by no means restricted to the military sphere <sup>28</sup>) where it is well-known: an army is always accompanied by a mantis. Leaving aside the still somewhat archaic Solon, who moreover may be speaking generally <sup>29</sup>), it is sufficient to quote Cicero *De div.* I, 95 (who depends on Poseidonios *Περὶ μαντικῆς*) *namque et Athenienses omnibus semper publicis consiliis divinos quosdam sacerdotes quos μάντιες vocant adhibuerunt*, and to refer to the names of some manteis famous in the Periclean age and the Peloponnesian War, viz. Lampon, Hierokles, and Stilbides, all of whom are mentioned by the comic poets <sup>30</sup>) and apparently were much in the public eye. Lampon is not only consulted about the significance of a *τέρας* in the same manner as Ph. was who in F 67 tells us about one of his cases himself <sup>31</sup>); we are also expressly told that he was *τῶν πολιτευομένων πολλάκις* <sup>32</sup>), and, in fact, we find him for thirty years speaking, advising, moving decrees in the Assembly about matters which are not wholly, though mainly, religious <sup>33</sup>). But that he belongs to the committee of the Ten sent to Thurioi <sup>34</sup>) *ἐπὶ τῷ κτίσαι αὐτήν*, is not because he spoke repeatedly in favour of the venture <sup>34</sup>) (probably reciting and expounding oracles which seemed to recommend it), but actually in his quality of mantis <sup>35</sup>). The nearest parallel is the decree *I G<sup>2</sup> I 39* about Chalkis in 446/5 B.C., where between amendments moved by Antikles and Arcestratos we read the following clause: *τὰ δὲ ἱερά τὰ ἐκ τῶν χρησμῶν ὑπὲρ Εὐβοίας θῦσαι ὡς τάχιστα μετὰ Ἱεροκλέους τρεῖς ἄνδρας, οὓς ἂν ἔληται ἡ βουλή σφῶν αὐτῶν · ὅπως δ' ἂν τάχιστα τυθῆι, οἱ στρατηγοὶ συνεπιμελώσθων καὶ τὸ ἀργύριον ἐς ταῦτα παρεχόντων* <sup>36</sup>). No doubt these were *ἱερά μαντευτά*, and Hierokles functioned as *μάντις*, as the manteis did who (according to Aristotle) are called in for assistance by the *ἱεροποιοί*. In this case it probably was Hierokles who interpreted for the Council and the people the oracles relating to Euboea. We may confidently assume that every foundation of a colony or the like was caused, or rather recommended, by oracles as is the case even with Nephelokokygia <sup>37</sup>). Our evidence about the political activity of the

manteis is not very extensive, but to all appearance they were the regular and permanent advisers of the State in almost all important affairs (as Cicero has it), the announcers and interpreters of the divine will from *σημεῖα* as well as from oracles which were preserved in the archives, 5 or taken from their own private stock, or finally received for a special purpose if (on the advice of the manteis?) the State had applied to Delphi. It may be surprising, but it is a fact that we do not find the exegetai on these or similar occasions, nor do we hear anything about a similar political activity of them though one would expect at least the *πυθόχρη-* 10 *στοι* to speak if a Delphic oracle is in question. We will not again discuss here the duties of the exegetai, nor will we raise the question whether the manteis, who assisted at certain sacrifices and explained *σημεῖα*, oracles, and other expressions of the divine will, also recommended remedies against a threatening danger. It is conceivable though (as far as I 15 know) there is no evidence for it <sup>38</sup>). But even if they did, this does not abolish the essential difference between them and the exegetai, who (again as far as I can see) are wholly concerned with expounding the sacred law (the so-called *πάτρια*) and consequently with ritual, while probably they had nothing (or next to nothing) to do with the offering of sacrifices 20 or with *σημεῖα* of the usual sort. We cannot always achieve quite precise distinctions, least of all in the domain of religion: the priests also have to perform ritual actions, and at least in earlier times they also functioned as diviners <sup>39</sup>). Nevertheless it is abundantly clear that *ιερείς*, *ἐξηγηταί*, *μάντις* (who together represent the religious personnel) are different 25 groups of officials. The difference in their activities, which is well expressed in their names <sup>40</sup>) and which is easy to explain by profane and religious history, must not be effaced, no matter whether a mantis could be chosen for one of the colleges of exegetai, and whether a mantis or an exegetes could hold office as priest. Those who obliterate these distinctions 30 make it impossible to comprehend the existence alongside of each other of the different groups of religious officials, which either were severally confined to strictly limited domains, or were preserved by religious conservatism even if their spheres of activity overlapped; and some overlapping there probably was <sup>41</sup>). In regard to Ph. the evidence of the 35 sources, or our interpretation of them, is corroborated by the other evidence we have about exegetai and manteis: he certainly was *μάντις καὶ ἱεροσόπος*, it is (or so it seems to me) certain that he was not an *ἐξηγητής*.

(6) A collection of oracles—comparable in a certain degree to the collection of Athenian inscriptions and the *Συναγωγή Ἡρωίδων*—would



not be impossible for Ph., but as Herodotos precedes in the compilation of χρησμούς ἀναγεγραφότες it cannot be inferred with any certainty at all. In the *Atthis* quite a number of oracles may have been cited; we need not even primarily think of Περὶ μαντικῆς.

5 (7) In this instance also we cannot decide whether Ph. wrote a special book with the title Περὶ ὀνειρώτων or the like, or whether his place in the list of Tertullian (which is by no means complete, and anyhow not taken from the catalogue of a library) is due to his very important work Περὶ μαντικῆς. A special work is never cited <sup>1)</sup>, and Ph. dealt with the Κανῶν  
 10 of Ps. Epicharmos <sup>2)</sup> in Περὶ μαντικῆς. This may perhaps explain why Tertullianus groups together these two authors and makes them stand out. The special book would in itself not be impossible: it would not have been the first, nor even the first Athenian book of the kind. Books about dreams and interpretations of dreams <sup>3)</sup> are remarkably numerous  
 15 as early as the fourth century B.C.: physicians, philosophers, and diviners write from very different points of view Περὶ ἐνυπνίων (Aristotle, Straton), Περὶ τῆς καθ' ὕπνου μαντικῆς (Aristotle), Περὶ ὀνειρώτων. The first work known to us, which seems to have remained permanently authoritative <sup>4)</sup>, is a book Περὶ κρίσεως ὀνειρώτων by the Athenian Anti-  
 20 phon <sup>5)</sup>, possibly written as early as the fifth century. The Suda A 2746 calls the author ὀνειροκρίτης, A 2744 τερατοσκόπος καὶ ἐποποιὸς καὶ σοφιστής, and notwithstanding all the difficulties of the Antiphon problem and the frequency of the name <sup>6)</sup>, one cannot very well separate him from the author of the Ἀλήθεια and Περὶ ὁμοιοῦς. For Aristotle ἐν γ' Περὶ  
 25 ποιητικῆς <sup>7)</sup> expressly calls the opponent of Sokrates ὁ τερατοσκόπος, and Didymos <sup>8)</sup>, who distinguishes between the orator and the sophist, characterizes the latter by the words ὁ καὶ τερατοσκόπος καὶ ὀνειροκρίτης λεγόμενος γενέσθαι... If Ph. (F 79) disputed the authenticity of the book ascribed to Epicharmos, we may assume that he reviewed the earlier  
 30 literature, and that he established his own views on divination by dreams.

(8) See above p. 256, 2 ff.; *F Gr Hist* no. 193 (II D p. 621); *Prosopogr. I. R<sup>3</sup>*. I (1933) no. 1239; 1241.

#### F(RAGMENTS)

(1-20) About the contents of books I-II see *Introd.* p. 251, 4 ff.  
 35 As we have no single event from the reign of Kekrops with the number of a book attached to it, the distribution of the material remains uncertain. It is possible and perhaps even probable that the account of the

individual reigns did not begin before the second book, and that the first book, in that case, served as a kind of introduction which, after some questions of principle concerning the tradition and its treatment by Ph.s predecessors <sup>1)</sup>, described primeval conditions and the civilizing activity of the first king Kekrops <sup>2)</sup>. In so far the assumption of Boeckh <sup>3)</sup> may be accepted that Ph. 'seems to have taken his departure from the origin of the human race', although instead of 'human race' we had perhaps better say 'the Athenian people'; for F 182, on which Boeckh founds his opinion, is specifically Athenian, and generally both chronicles and ethnographies opened with the origin of an individual people, not (as e.g. the book of the philosopher Hekataios <sup>4)</sup> did) with that of mankind. But F 2 makes it appear at least possible that Ph. was influenced to some extent by the general speculations on the development of culture, and that he did not simply begin with the place of the Ionian Athenians in the pedigree of the Greeks <sup>5)</sup>. It is further uncertain whether, and if so how far, book II extended beyond the period of the kings. Although some of the facts recorded in the fragments 168 ff. might belong to this time, as the *Atthides* assigned many institutions, facts of cult, and inventions aitiologically to certain kings, according to the tradition or to their interpretation of it, there is not one fragment that can be assigned with any assurance <sup>6)</sup> to one of their reigns and to the more than six centuries between Theseus <sup>7)</sup> and Solon <sup>8)</sup>. Thus it is possible that the second book contained the whole pre-Solonian period.

It is certain *a priori* that Ph. must have carried down the list of the kings beyond Theseus to the first ἀρχων ἐνιαύσιος, the appointment of whom the *Atthis* of the Parian Marble entered under 683/2 B.C. <sup>9)</sup>. The change in the nature of the highest authority, when kingship was converted into archonship for life, as known already to Aristotle <sup>10)</sup>, is not shown by any difference in the form of the dating or in the title of the ruler in the Parian Marble <sup>11)</sup>, and nobody will venture to decide from F 211 whether Ph. in the introductory formulas called the Medontids kings or archons. Δεκαετείς occur neither in his fragments nor in the Parian Marble. Judging from F 92-98 it is certain that the king-list of Ph. opened with Kekrops. We are obliged to believe in the information given in F 92, according to which he expressly rejected the list of the kings before Kekrops; F 94 in itself does not exclude them, but it does exclude local kings after Kekrops. We do not know in how far their names occasionally occurred in Ph.s *Atthis* or in his special works as eponyms <sup>12)</sup>. Nor are all the nine (eleven) kings before the conquest of

Troy mentioned in the fragments. In the following list the kings that may be inferred are put in curved brackets ( ), the missing kings in square brackets [ ]. It is impossible even to suggest the duration of their reigns, or to give absolute dates, because we are not acquainted with the chronological system of Ph. <sup>13</sup>).

Name	Nr. in <i>M. Par.</i>	F with	F without	Facts
		number of book		
Kekrops	1	(2? 3/4?)	92-98; 105	Beginning of civilisation; (Areopagos?); Twelve towns of Attica; Kekrops' daughters.
[Kranaos]	2	(3/4?)	—	(Areopagos?)
Amphiktyon	3	5-7	—	Cult of Dionysos
15 Erichthonios	4	8-9 (10)	(102)	Cult of Athene and Panathenaia
[Pandion]	5	—	—	—
Erechtheus	6	11-13; (14-16)	(103/4; 105)	Oreithyia; (Advent of Demeter); Eumolpos War
20 [Kekrops II]	7	—	—	—
[Pandion II]	8	—	(107)	(Division of Attica)
(Aigeus)	9	—	(107)	(Division of Attica)
Theseus	10	17-19	108-113; (200)	Deeds of Theseus
25 [Menestheus]	11	—	—	—

(1) This is the only surviving scrap of a (perhaps extensive) discussion on the tradition and the predecessors of Ph.; but we may suppose that the notice in T 1 about the *Atthis* having been directed against Demon ultimately derived from this preface <sup>1</sup>). In that case Ph., differing herein from Thukydides (1, 20), when criticising at least his immediate predecessor did not refrain from mentioning his name. Unfortunately we cannot recognize whether the antagonism between the two authors concerned political and religious views, or methods of treatment and facts, nor can we decide whether the list of kings disputed in F 92 was that of Demon. If the proverb is not simply used as such (and it is not

very probable that it is <sup>2)</sup>), it has a bearing on the question of Ph.s rationalism, which was quite compatible with his strictly religious convictions <sup>3)</sup>.

(2) Both versions derive from Oros, who is quoted in **b**. This version 5 has preserved the correct number of the book (it is out of the question that Ph. dealt with the origin of the town and the term  $\xi\sigma\tau\upsilon$  in the eleventh book), reproduces the exact wording at the beginning, and makes it clear where the quotation ends. The concluding sentence of **a** 'Ἀθηναῖοι —  $\acute{\omega}\iota\kappa\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ , though it most probably is in harmony with Ph.s opinion, 10 hardly belongs to the context of the quotation; we find it repeated anonymously in Steph. Byz. s.v. 'Ἀθηναῖοι with a slight alteration pointing to a heurematic source <sup>1)</sup>. The true difficulty consists in its not being clear whether the reference of  $\pi\rho\sigma\eta\gamma\acute{o}\rho\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\nu$ ,  $\zeta\acute{\omega}\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$ ,  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\lambda\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$  etc. is to 'men' or to 'the Athenians'. Thus doubts arise as to whether we 15 may connect F 2 immediately with the civilizing activity of Kekrops in F 93-98, as at first sight one would like to do. It does not signify that Kekrops is not the grammatical subject, as in F 93/7, for his name might be inferred from the context from which  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota$  Κέκροπος in F 98 is taken, and the etymology of  $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\upsilon$  may be compared with that of  $\lambda\alpha\omicron\iota$  in 20 F 95. More important, however, appears the term  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\lambda\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$  as compared with  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\omicron\iota\kappa\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\iota$ ,  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\alpha\gamma\alpha\gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$  in F 94, but even that would not decisively contradict the reference to Kekrops and the Athenians. Heurematography knows Kekrops as the founder of the first town (of course there are rival claimants): Plin. *N. H.* 7, 194 *laterarias ac domos constituerunt primi* 25 *Euryalus et Hyperbius fratres Athenis; antea specus erant pro domibus . . . oppidum <primum? (Mayhoff) > Cecrops a se appellavit Cecropiam, quae nunc est arx Athenis. aliqui Argos a Phoroneo rege ante conditum volunt, quidam et Sicyonem, Aegyptii vero multo ante apud ipsos Diospolin.* Nevertheless the idea recurs that the sentence is more likely to have been 30 taken from a description of the general development of civilization which preceded the special account of Kekrops' activity even if we assume *a priori* that Ph., here as elsewhere, gave as example Athens, or rather that he claimed for the Athenians the distinction of having been the first to take the step from a nomad life to fixed settlements <sup>2)</sup>. 35 Turning to the matter it is perhaps difficult to believe in the sequence: foundation of one  $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\upsilon$  by Kekrops; dissolution into twelve towns by the same; concentration back again by Theseus to one  $\pi\acute{\omicron}\lambda\iota\varsigma$  <sup>3)</sup>; but in any case, Boeckh's conception that F 2 relates to the synoecism by Theseus <sup>4)</sup>, improbable in itself, is due to his *petitio principii* that 'by  $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\upsilon$  the

entire town is denoted'. Concerning the form, the etymology common to both versions from  $\alpha$  (=  $\delta\mu\omicron\upsilon$ ) and  $\sigma\tau\eta\nu\alpha\iota$ , for which Ph. alone is quoted, is as general as that of the glossographer Eumolpos <sup>5</sup>), who may have polemized against Ph.: *παρὰ τὸ ἄνω Ἰστασθαί· ἐπὶ μετεώρου γὰρ κεῖνται αἱ πόλεις* <sup>6</sup>). Although Ph. has always Athens in his mind, *ἄστν*, etymologically speaking, is not simply 'the town of Athens' (which even in Kekrops' time is called *Κεκροπία*: F 94), nor 'the town' of Athens as opposed to the *χώρα* <sup>7</sup>), the Peiraieus, Eleusis, or some particular deme <sup>8</sup>); nor even 'the lower part of the town' as opposed to the (akro)polis <sup>9</sup>), but (and this is confirmed by the plural *κοινὰ οἰκῆσεις*; cf. also *ἄστη καὶ πόλεις*) actually *ἡ κοινῶς πόλις*, the urban settlement quite generally which one can either paraphrase by *πόλις*, or distinguish from that term in two directions according to whether one accentuates the political notion of the *πόλις* <sup>10</sup>) or the fact of the fortification <sup>11</sup>). The establishment of this etymology by Ph.—whether or no it referred to Athens—signifies a contrast in the method of the scholar to the usage in earlier discussion which applies the wrong thesis that *παρὰ μόνους τῶν Ἑλλήνων τὴν πόλιν ἄστν καλεῖσθαι* (*scil.* *ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων*), *μετενηγεμένης τῆς προσηγορίας ἀπὸ τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῖς* (*scil.* *τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις, ὑπὸ τῶν Σαιτῶν*) *ἄστεος* <sup>12</sup>). In Ph.'s opinion *ἄστν* is not only Athenian, but Athens was the first *ἄστν*, like *λαοί* F 95. The fact that the etymologies are wild does not affect the principle which signifies a progress, and the etymology of *ἄστν* is perhaps not even wrong <sup>13</sup>).

*οὐ μετανέστησαν*] merely indicates in this context the contrast to *νομάδας*, as *οἰκῆσεις* indicates that to *σποράδην ζῆν*; it cannot at the same time contain a reference to the autochthony of the Athenians(-Ionians), which would anyhow not be suitable in this place: that *τὸ μὲν* (*scil.* *Ἴωνικὸν γένος*) *οὐδαμῇ κω ἐξεχώρησε* (Herodt. I, 56, 2) and, without *μεταναστήσεις*, *τὴν γοῦν Ἀττικὴν ἐκ τοῦ ἐπὶ πλεῖστον . . . ἄνθρωποι οἰκουν οἱ αὐτοὶ αἰεὶ* (Thuk. I, 2, 1; 5) may have been an established fact in the opinion of Ph. too, but where he stated it and what reasons he gave for it, we do not know <sup>14</sup>).

(3-4) According to F 3 Ph. reported the institution of the Areopagos in the beginning of Attic history, whereas he probably discussed it more extensively when dealing with the constitution of Solon (F 20); as to the contents F 4 rather belongs to that context than to F 3. He further discussed the functions of the Areopagos at the time of Demetrios of Phaleron in his seventh book (F 64/5), and F 64 proves (though there is no need of proof) that he entered the measures taken by Ephialtes in his third (or fourth) book; F 196 points with less certainty to the position

of the Areopagos in the fourth century (book V or VI), or in the constitution of Demetrios of Phaleron. Unfortunately the collective quotations mentioning Ph. together with Androtion (F 4; 20) and Phanodemus (F 196), abbreviated and partly confused as they are, yield few traits either positive or characteristic of Ph. In explaining the name (F 3) he followed the general tradition of the *Atthides*<sup>1</sup>) according to which—and so far at least Aischylos is in agreement with it—the ‘Council of the hill of Ares’ is the homicide court, as it was since 462/1 B.C., after Ephialtes had deprived it of the νομοφυλακία and μόνα κατέλιπε τὰ ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος (F 64). Before that the Areopagos judged what F 4 calls ‘nearly all σφάλματα and παρανομίαι’. The expression is vague and untechnical, but probably means the position described by Aristotle (1) in the time before Solon Ἰθπ. 3, 6 ἡ δὲ τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν βουλή τὴν μὲν τάξιν εἶχε τοῦ διατηρεῖν τοὺς νόμους, διώκει δὲ τὰ πλεῖστα καὶ τὰ μέγιστα τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει, καὶ 15 κολάζουσα καὶ ζημιούσα πάντας τοὺς ἀκοσμοῦντας κυρίως; (2) in the time after Solon 8, 4 βουλήν δ’ ἐποίησε τετρακοσίους. . . . τὴν δὲ τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν ἔταξεν ἐπὶ τὸ νομοφυλακεῖν, ὥσπερ ὑπῆρχεν καὶ πρότερον ἐπίσκοπος οὕσα τῆς πολιτείας, καὶ τὰ τε ἄλλα τὰ πλεῖστα καὶ τὰ μέγιστα τῶν πολιτικῶν διετηρεῖ, καὶ τοὺς ἀμαρτάνοντας ἠθύθεν κυρία οὕσα καὶ ζημιοῦν καὶ κολάζειν, καὶ τὰς 20 ἐκτίσεις ἀνέφερεν εἰς πόλιν, οὐκ ἐπιγράφουσα τὴν πρόφασιν δι’ ὃ τὸ ἐκτίνεσθαι. The two functions of νομοφυλακεῖν and κολάζειν καὶ ζημιοῦν τοὺς ἀκοσμοῦντας can (at a pinch) be subordinated to the notion δικάζειν, and even the new function assigned to the Areopagos by Solon—Ἰθπ. 8, 4 καὶ τοὺς ἐπὶ καταλύσει τοῦ δήμου συνισταμένους ἔκρινεν, Σόλωνος θέντος νόμον 25 εἰσαγγελίας περὶ αὐτῶν — belongs to the sphere of jurisdiction. Beyond the δικάζειν, showing the Areopagos as being the actual government, reaches the διοικεῖν τὰ πλεῖστα καὶ τὰ μέγιστα τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει. According to this conception the Areopagos regains this position μετὰ τὰ Μηδικὰ not by a modification of the constitution, but in practice διὰ τὸ γενέσθαι τῆς περὶ 30 Σαλαμῖνα ναυμαχίας αἰτία (Ἰθπ. 23, 1)—we therefore must assume that its rights had been restricted in the meantime—and loses it only seventeen years later and now definitely through Ephialtes. The main difference between the Areopagos before Solon and after consists (according to the same conception) in the fact that the functions of the former also include 35 the appointment of the officials—τὸ γὰρ ἀρχαῖον ἢ ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ βουλή ἀνακαλεσαμένη καὶ κρίνασα καθ’ αὐτὴν τὸν ἐπιτήδειον ἐφ’ ἑκάστη τῶν ἀρχῶν ἐπ’ ἐνιαυτὸν διατάξασα ἀπέστελλεν (Ἰθπ. 8, 2) — who after Solon are elected by the Assembly ἐκ προκρίτων (*ib.* 8, 1). That is a clear development, complete in itself, according to which Solon restricted the rights of the

old Council of the nobility not very drastically, depriving it merely of the appointment of the officials. On the other hand, the transference of that right to the Assembly and the creation of the new Council of the Four Hundred constitute the first step on the road to the complete  
 5 exclusion of the Areopagos from the government of the State and its restriction to jurisdiction in matters of homicide. There is only one gap in this history, but we may confidently fill it by inserting Kleisthenes and the creation of the Council of the Five Hundred, which from 479/8 B.C. to 462/1 B.C. (practically, not constitutionally) loses its influence to what  
 10 (for this period) may be called the 'Upper House'. If this was the conception of Androtion (and it is most likely that Aristotle took it over from him <sup>2)</sup>) Ph. probably accepted it unchanged, and this would explain the collective quotations in F 4 and 20. The only question (which we have not to decide or even to discuss here) is whether and how far this  
 15 conception is founded on a historical knowledge of changes in the position of the Areopagos made before Ephialtes by the legislations of Solon and Kleisthenes, or whether and how far it rests on inferences drawn in the first line from mentions of the Areopagos in Solon's laws, supplemented and coloured by wishful imagination and idealization of the πάτριος  
 20 πολιτεία.

ἐν Ατθίδος β] If on F 1-20 we determined the contents of book I correctly Ph. moved the establishment of the Areopagos, against the usual and natural conception <sup>3)</sup> but in agreement with the *Atthis* (or one of the *Althides*) of the Parian Marble <sup>4)</sup>, down to the reign of the second king  
 25 Kranaos <sup>5)</sup>. That Kekrops is regarded by some writers as the first legislator of Athens <sup>6)</sup> would not contradict this suggestion. Chronological considerations were perhaps less decisive in this matter than the wish to be able to report some events of this period, which was rather empty otherwise. Kranaos, whose tomb was shown ἐν τοῖς Λαμπυρεῦσι <sup>7)</sup> and  
 30 whose antiquity is attested by the gentilician cult (?) of the Χαρίδαι <sup>8)</sup>, is an expletive figure in the list of kings, his actual function being to provide names one from himself for the town or their inhabitants <sup>9)</sup>, another from his daughter Atthis for the country <sup>10)</sup>. He is not attested by a fragment of Ph., but he must have been in his list.

35 (5-7) These fragments are taken from an obviously extensive digression about Dionysos, of which perhaps F 170/3 also formed a part. We cannot recognize its scheme, but it certainly contained (1) the arrival of the god in Athens as the chronological fact; (2) aitiologies closely connected with this arrival, both of a general custom, *viz.* diluting the

wine by admixture of water, and of a specifically Athenian *Θέσιμον*, also of cult-images at Athens; (3) particulars of other cults of Dionysos; (4) a discussion about the nature (where the criticism of diverging conceptions should be observed), the myths and the 'death' of the god; (5) possibly  
 5 in the same connexion something about the representation of the god in art. The nature and number of the quotations, when compared with the few and incidental facts we learn from the *Atthis* about Demeter (F 103/4) and even Athena (F 8/10; 102) seem to prove that the digression was remarkable within Ph.'s otherwise succinct treatment of the period  
 10 of the kings. The reason may be found in the particular interest of the theologian: the conception of Dionysos underwent a change during the life-time of Ph., because, as the mythical predecessor of Alexander, he became the 'ideal des welterobernden und weltbeglückenden herrschers' <sup>1</sup>). Also the number of worshippers had greatly increased when  
 15 the mystic side of the character of the god gained ground <sup>2</sup>). Thus the figure had become something of a problem. F 6 (and 7?) must be regarded in connexion with the former change: the general view of the god which it represents is different from the purely local one in F 5. Concerning the second development we are handicapped by our limited knowledge of  
 20 theological literature proper, particularly of the *Τελεταί*; but that speculation concerned itself with Dionysos long before Ph. is shown by some passages in Euripides' *Bakchai* which (characteristically) have often been regarded as interpolations. We cannot ascertain whether Ph. also took into account books like that of Euhemerus.

25 (5) Not the dating, always indispensable in an *Atthis*, but its form and the contents of the fragment show that Ph. has the city in mind: he passes over the special claims of villages, clans, and demes in favour of the king of Attica who alone acts. I am quite prepared to admit that those claims have been mentioned elsewhere, perhaps even in the *Atthis*,  
 30 but we do not know any particulars apart perhaps from F 206 which may have noted the tradition of the Semachidai. No trace of the very similar Ikarios story, which later on Eratosthenes shaped poetically <sup>1</sup>), is preserved in the fragments. Concerning Eleutherai, whence τὸ ζῶαρον Ἀθηναίους ἐχομίσθη τὸ ἀρχαῖον <sup>2</sup>) and for the god of which the Διονύσια  
 35 ἐν ἄστει <sup>3</sup>) are celebrated, there exists the chronological difficulty that according to the tradition the place did not become Attic until the reign of king Melanthos <sup>4</sup>). The compromise version that Pegasos (who for the Greeks carries the πηγαί in his name) takes the god from Eleutherai (then a Boeotian town) to Athens <sup>5</sup>) is impossible for Ph.: his Amphiktyon



learns παρά Διονύσου directly, and he does not establish the cult of Dionysos Eleuthereus, but an altar of Dionysos Orthos. I cannot see in this report 'a tacit protest' against the bringing of Delphi into the tale <sup>6</sup>), but merely the general endeavour of the *Atthis* to deal, at least primarily, with Athens, not with demes, because this was the only way to achieve the unity of the narrative. Even the Demeter of the Parian Marble (239 A 12) comes εἰς Ἀθήνας. If one tried to insert here, on the occasion of the appearance of the god, an intermediate place of sojourn, one would get into a difficulty: Eusebios makes the Dionysos of the Semachidai, Pausanias <sup>10</sup> him of Eleutherai, appear during the reign of Amphiktyon, and the god of Ikaria is even earlier. Ἀμφικτύονα] His connexion with Dionysos seems to date the appearance of the god three or four generations earlier than that of Demeter, but the authority for the connexion remains open to doubt. If it can actually be traced back to the 6th century B.C. <sup>7</sup>) it was tradition for Ph., the same which determined the interpretation <sup>15</sup> (for such it is) of the ceramic group by Chalkosthenes. In any case, this tradition was wide-spread though the certain evidence is later than Ph. <sup>8</sup>): Pausan. I, 2, 5 μετὰ δὲ τὸ Διονύσου τέμενός ἐστιν οἶκημα ἀγάλματα ἔχον ἐκ <sup>20</sup> πηλοῦ <sup>9</sup>), βασιλεὺς Ἀθηναίων Ἀμφικτύων ἄλλους τε θεοὺς ἐστιῶν καὶ Διόνυσον ἐνταῦθα καὶ Πήγασός ἐστιν Ἐλευθερεὺς, δὲ Ἀθηναίους <τὸν> θεὸν ἐσήγαγε, συνεπέλαβετο δὲ οἱ τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς μαντεῖον ἀναμνήσαν τὴν ἐπὶ Ἰκαρίου ποτὲ ἐπιδημίαν τοῦ θεοῦ. Euseb. *a. Abr.* 520 (= first year of Amphiktyon; *Deucalionis filius* belongs to the king's name) *Dionysus verum non ille Semelae filius cum in Atticam pervenisset, hospitio receptus a Semacho* <sup>25</sup> *filiae eius capreae pellem largitus est* <sup>10</sup>). The birth of the son of Semele is dated *a. Abr.* 629 under Erechtheus <sup>11</sup>), the Indian campaign *a. Abr.* 687 under Kekrops II; in both cases the note *gesta Persei* occurs in the immediate neighbourhood <sup>12</sup>). In this instance the distinction of the god from the son of Semele derives from Kastor, but the date of the <sup>30</sup> arrival of the god is taken from an *Atthis*: according to the former (250 F 1) under Belos <sup>13</sup>) *Herakles und Dion<is>os, welche von den Titanen waren*, help the gods in their fight against the Titans and Gigants; (*ibid.* 1d) under Belochos <sup>14</sup>) *Dionesios und Perseus waren um diese zeiten (und es wandte sich Perseus zur flucht vor Dionysos dem sohn der Semele: Kephalion); (ibid.* 4) *Kekrops (II), bruder des Erechtheus, unter welchem des Dionisos geschichte*. The distinction is earlier: Diod. 3, 68 (= Dionys. Skythobr. 32 F 8); 4, 4, 1 (taken from the mythographer) μυθολογοῦσι δὲ <sup>35</sup> τινες καὶ ἕτερον Διόνυσον (besides the son of Semele 4, 2-3) γεγονέναι πολὺ τοῖς χρόνοις προτεροῦντα τούτου· φασὶ γὰρ ἐκ Διὸς καὶ Περσεφόνης Διόνυσον

γενέσθαι τὸν ὑπὸ τινῶν Σαβάζιον ὀνομαζόμενον. It remains uncertain whether Ph. knew or acknowledged the distinction. τὴν τοῦ οἴνου χρᾶσιν κτλ.] These words claim for Athens an act of civilization which as such is a εὐρημα. Differing from the history of Demeter in the Parian Marble <sup>15</sup>), who ἀφικομένη εἰς Ἀθήνας καρπὸν ἐφ[εῦρ]εν, this act does not consist in the invention of the vine or the gift of wine, but in the adding of water to the wine. The distinction is frequently drawn <sup>16</sup>), for instance by the heurematographers: Plin. *N. H.* 7, 199 *culturam vitium et arborum Eumolpus Atheniensis, vinum aquae misceri Staphylus, Sileni filius.*

<sup>10</sup> But the prominence given to the adding of water as the boon of Dionysos seems to be peculiar to Ph., and it is evidently connected with his general conception of the god. That is why he does not attribute to Amphiktyon the establishment of one of the well-known early τεμένη of Dionysos, for instance that of the ἐν Λίμναις Διονύσου, ὧι τὰ ἀρχαιότερα Διονύσια <sup>15</sup> ποιεῖται <sup>17</sup>) or that of the Ἐλευθερεὺς <sup>18</sup>); instead he selects two altars <sup>19</sup>) suitable to support this general conception. They stand in the sanctuary of the Horai the position of which is unknown <sup>20</sup>), but their connexion with Dionysos is early and proved for Athens by vases and otherwise; and Ph. probably explained the choice of that place by pointing to the <sup>20</sup> character of these goddesses <sup>21</sup>). Consequently in his opinion the altar of Orthos is the oldest monument of the worship of Dionysos in Athens, and its god, called by the thesmion Ἀγαθὸς θεός (not δαίμων) and placed at the side of Ζεὺς Σωτήρ, is, as it were, the essential Dionysos. There is no other evidence for the cult-name, and the interpretation of Ph. is <sup>25</sup> certainly wrong <sup>22</sup>); but since he uses it for his proof he cannot have invented it, and the attempt to identify Orthos with Ἄκρατος <sup>23</sup>) is definitely a failure. I deliberately left aside the question whether Ph. identified the Ἐλευθερεὺς with the ἐν Λίμναις Διόνυσος. If he did it would put an end to the discussion on the point <sup>24</sup>), for we should have to <sup>30</sup> believe him. Personally I think that the fragment of Kallimachos, quoted also in the commentary on Thukydides 2, 15, 4, cannot be understood otherwise <sup>25</sup>): Kallimachos cannot but have taken it from an *Atthis*, and he did use Ph. in the *Hekale* <sup>26</sup>). Moreover Phanodemos 325 F 12 uses the invention of mixing wine with water in order to explain the cult- <sup>35</sup> name Λιμναῖος which actually does not exist, for the god is officially called ὁ ἐν Λίμναις Διόνυσος. It is tempting to suggest accordingly that the altars of Διόνυσος Ὀρθός and the Horai were in the precinct of the god ἐν Λίμναις. But the foundation of that combination is uncertain as the papyrus does not allow of a safe restoration of Kallimachos' distich.

θέσμιον ἔθετο] It is doubtful whether the subject is still Amphiktyon; there may be a gap in the text or in the excerpt, if the last sentence derives from Ph. at all. The θέσμιον again is not an invention of Ph., nor is it certain that he was the first to record it. He is not the source either of general mythography or of its rationalisation both of which call the god Ἄγαθος δαίμων and ascribe to him not the mixing of the wine but its invention or introduction: Diod. 4, 3, 4 τῆς δὲ κατὰ τὸν οἶνον εὐρέσεως καὶ δωρεᾶς κεχαρισμένης τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καθ' ὑπερβολὴν διὰ τε τὴν ἡδονὴν τὴν ἐκ τοῦ ποτοῦ καὶ διὰ τὸ τοῖς σώμασιν εὐτονωτέρους γίνεσθαι τοὺς τὸν οἶνον πίνοντας, φασὶν ἐπὶ τὸ δεῖπνον, ὅταν ἀκρατος οἶνος ἐπιδιδῶται, προσεπιλέγειν Ἄγαθοῦ δαίμονος, ὅταν δὲ μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνον διδῶται κεκραμένος ὕδατι, Διὸς Σωτήρος ἐπιφωνεῖν· τὸν γὰρ οἶνον ἀκρατον μὲν πινόμενον μανιώδεις διαθέσεις ἀποτελεῖν, τοῦ δ' ἀπὸ Διὸς δμβρου μίγντος τὴν μὲν τέρψιν καὶ τὴν ἡδονὴν μένειν, τὸ δὲ τῆς μανίας καὶ παραλύσεως βλάπτον διορθοῦσθαι. Athen. 15, 17 p. 675 A-C Φιλωνίδης δ' ὁ ἰατρός<sup>27)</sup> ἐν τῷ Περί μύρων καὶ στεφάνων ἐκ τῆς Ἐρυθρᾶς, φησὶν, θαλάσσης ὑπὸ Διονύσου μετενεχθείσης εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα τῆς ἀμπέλου, καὶ πρὸς ἄμετρον ἀπόλαυσιν τῶν πολλῶν ἐκτρεπομένων ἀκρατὸν τε προσφερομένων † αὐτῶν, οἱ μὲν μανιωδῶς † ἐκτρεπόμενοι παρέβαιον, οἱ δὲ νεκροῖς ἐώικεσαν ἀπὸ τῆς καρώσεως. ἐπ' ἀκτῆς δὲ τινων πινόντων, ἐπιπεσῶν δμβρος τὸ μὲν συμπόσιον διέλυσε, τὸν δὲ κρατῆρα, ὃς εἶχεν ὀλίγον οἶνον ὑπολειμμένον, ἐπλήρωσεν ὕδατος. γενομένης δ' αἰθρίας εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν ὑποστρέψαντες τόπον, γευσάμενοι τοῦ μίγματος προσῆνῃ καὶ ἄλυπον ἔσχον ἀπόλαυσιν· καὶ διὰ τοῦθ' οἱ "Ἕλληνες τῷ μὲν παρὰ δεῖπνον ἀκράτῳ προσδιδόμενοι τὸν Ἄγαθὸν ἐπιφωνοῦσι δαίμονα, τιμῶντες τὸν εὐρόντα [δαίμονα] — ἦν δ' οὗτος ὁ Διόνυσος — τῷ δὲ μετὰ δεῖπνον κεκραμένῳ πρώτῳ [προσ]διδόμενῳ ποτηρίῳ Δία Σωτῆρα ἐπιλέγουσι, τῆς ἐκ τοῦ μίγματος ἀλύπου κράσεως τὸν καὶ τῶν δμβρων αἴτιον ἀρχηγὸν ὑπολαβόντες.

(6) Ph. is quoted only because the lexicographer believed that his connection of the terms βωμολόχος τις καὶ κόβαλος furnished an explanation of the second one; but it is not at all certain that Ph., whose style was simple, regarded them as synonyms. C. Mueller's translation 'scurram et deceptorem' is probably correct, and it seems appropriate in this context to think of the Kobaloi who, according to Schol. Aristoph. *Plut.* 279<sup>28)</sup>, are δαίμονές τινες σκληροὶ περὶ Διόνυσον, imps alternately of a teasing and of a wicked nature. The ancient interpretations, as far as they do not treat the words as synonyms<sup>29)</sup>, do not help much; but the better ones stress the ἀπατητικόν and the πανουργία<sup>30)</sup> in regard to κόβαλος, and in regard to βωμολόχος (jester, buffoon, parasite) the ἀνελεύθερον, i.e. the coarse and undignified quality, which recoils from

nothing, of their παιδιὰ and κολακεία<sup>4</sup>). Both terms are low, and sometimes contemptuous. As Harpokration excerpted merely the reason for the equation of βωμολόχος and κόβαλος we cannot decide whether Ph. refuted some individual story which did not agree with his conception of the god,  
5 or whether the quotation is taken from a general description of his nature.

We cannot clearly recognize either the idea Ph. had of the god or his treatment. Did he present his conception in a complete theology of Dionysos, or did he only set forth certain facts of the cult<sup>5</sup>) and interpret them (like the Dionysos Orthos in F 5), in which case his selection would  
10 reveal his general conception? Both F 5 and F 6 are evidence of his having moved into the background the pleasant and easy-going traits as well as the wild and enthusiastic vein in the character of the many-sided god. Positively Dionysos was, of course, for Ph. the god of wine—not of vegetation generally, although his first Athenian altar was in the  
15 sanctuary of the Horai—and consequently a bringer of civilisation<sup>6</sup>). But did he also believe him to be the god of the dead (F 12?), and what was his attitude towards the Dionysos of Orphism and the mysteries?

(7) Because of this fragment Ph. is generally regarded as the earliest witness for the tomb of Dionysos at Delphi<sup>1</sup>); but the Orphic tradition  
20 (about which Ph. was as well informed as he was about Delphi) most probably is earlier. According to Kallimachos<sup>2</sup>) Apollo buries Dionysos, torn to pieces by the Titans, παρὰ τῷ τρίποδι, or (as an Orphic fragment, which Kern<sup>3</sup>) puts among the 'veteriora', has it) εἰς τὸν Παρνασσὸν φέρων κατατίθεται διεσπασμένον τὸν νεκρόν. As the 'Ἀπόλλων χρυσοῦς of the poet  
25 Deinarchos<sup>4</sup>) stood 'in the innermost part of the temple'<sup>5</sup>) the version is consistent in itself<sup>6</sup>), and it was the Euhemeristic treatment of the πράξεις Διονύσου which transferred the story from the god to the son of Semele and connected it with his war against Perseus. The question what Ph.'s attitude was requires an analysis of the records parallel to  
30 F 7. It must be noticed beforehand that F 7 does not derive from scientific literature (as F 5/6; 170/2 do) but from the sphere of novels and handbooks. Their mode of dealing with Dionysos we understand e.g. from Diodoros 3, 66, 4 ff.; 4, 2 ff. The immediate source of F 7 is even later: it belongs to the period of the Roman emperors and possibly to the  
35 tendentious Euhemerism of Christian controversy. The lucid version of Eusebios seems to follow the account of the poet Deinarchos which ends with the death and the tomb of Dionysos, whence it infers the human nature of the god. Learned quotations are not rare in handbooks; that of Ph. here is meant to corroborate the inference, but actually gives

a wrong reason for the fact that the god is represented in art (γράφεται) as θηλύμορφος. Ph. discussed this point in some detail, and that bare fact is all we learn with certainty from F 7a for his digression on Dionysos, for Eusebios eliminated a full explanation (διὰ τε ἑλλας αἰτίας καὶ) as to the nature of which the term αἰσχράς (the usual Christian judgement on everything belonging to the domain of mysteries and τελεταί) allows of an inference. It is doubtful whether the remaining reason, the δπλῖζειν τὰς θηλείας, actually is one of the αἰτίαι mentioned by Ph., or (this is perhaps more likely) part of Deinarchos' account of the exploits of the son of Semele. Malalas in his ample history of Boeotia derives from the same source as Eusebios by means of several intermediaries<sup>7)</sup>, but he rendered it carelessly and, according to his custom, he distributed his quotations arbitrarily: Not to mention minor misunderstandings, the passage about the thelymorphic representation of the god has shrunk to the vague insertion ὡσαύτως — συνεγράψατο which interrupts the description of Dionysos' tomb: ἐν ἧ ἐκθέσει most probably does not refer to Ph. but to Deinarchos, for the inscription preserved only by Malalas is proof that the seeming βάθρον is in reality the tomb of the god. Thus as far as tradition is concerned, Ph. as a witness for the tomb at Delphi drops out. If he knew of such a tomb—and the indubitable fact of his having acknowledged Dionysos as a god would not preclude a tomb—it can only have been that of the Orphic Dionysos. In that case the question arises whether he was the god who came to Athens under Amphyktyon (F 5), and who was not the son of Semele. We have to take into account Ph.'s other works, variants, and polemics (F 6), and we do not know for certain either whether Ph. mentioned the tomb of Dionysos in the *Atthis* or at all, or whether he distinguished in the *Atthis* the god, who need not have been 'born' in Thebes<sup>8)</sup>, from the son of Semele. Nor can we tell whether, and if so to what extent, he dealt with those πράξεις Διονύσου which did not affect Athens<sup>9)</sup>. Διονύσου πράξεις] Deinarchos' enumeration of the exploits of Dionysos takes the god from India to Argos, and as he dies in the latter place he may have been born and reared in the former. Everything mentioned between these two places then indicates his expedition from the East through Thrace (Lykurgos) and Boeotia (Pentheus) to Argos (it would be tempting to insert Athens, but the sequence Ἀκταίωνα καὶ Πενθέα makes this suggestion doubtful). About the connexion of Perseus with Dionysos in chronography see above p. 269, 27 f.: there are variants, for according to Eusebios<sup>10)</sup> Dionysos was killed in battle, according to (Kastor and) Kephalion

Perseus fled from him. The tradition about Dionysos in the Argolid is abundant and not quite late <sup>11</sup>): apparently part of it treated Perseus increasingly like Pentheus <sup>12</sup>); it also shows some resemblance to the Attic history of the Amazons. This tradition knows of a battle and a  
 5 victory of Perseus who kills many Maenads, but also of a λύσις τοῦ ἔχθους and of the establishment of a cult of Διόνυσος Κρήσιος <sup>13</sup>). On the other hand Euphorion (F 17 Scheidw.) recorded the conquest and destruction of Argos. It is hard to believe that any of these events—even if only as reports or controversial matter—were mentioned in the *Atthis*. Θηλύ-  
 10 μορφος] Pentheus calls Dionysos θ. ξένος in Eurip. *Bakch.* 353 <sup>14</sup>), apparently without the suggestion of any deeper meaning. Such a meaning, however, is conveyed by the epithet as applied to the god of vegetation <sup>15</sup>) described by Porphyry <sup>16</sup>): τῶν δὲ ἀκροδρύων καὶ ὄλων τῶν φυτευτικῶν ἡ δύναμις Διόνυσος ὀνομάζεται. ὄρα δὲ καὶ τούτων τὰς εἰκόνας· σύμβολα γὰρ ἡ Κόρη <κέ-  
 15 ρατα ? > φέρει τῆς προβολῆς τῶν κατὰ τοὺς καρπούς ὑπὲρ τὴν γῆν ἐκφύσεων, ὁ δὲ Διόνυσος κοινὰ μὲν πρὸς τὴν Κόρην ἔχει τὰ κέρατα· ἔστι δὲ θηλύμορφος, μνηίων τὴν περὶ τὴν γένεσιν τῶν ἀκροδρύων ἀρρενόθηλον δύναμιν. This and similar statements may, in this form, be 'late theological speculations' <sup>17</sup>), but the Stoa already tries to deal with the question of θηλυμορφία: Cornut. 30  
 20 p. 59, 6 L τῆς δ' ἐν τοῖς πότοις παιδιᾶς, εἰτ' ἐκστάσεως σύμβολόν εἰσιν οἱ Σάτυροι . . . διὰ τούτων δ' ἴσως παρίσταται τὸ ὡσαυτεῖ μετ' ἐκλύσεως καὶ θηλυτήτος παράφορον τῶν πιόντων. τούτου δ' ἔνεκεν καὶ θηλυμορφος μὲν πλάττεται, κέρατα δ' ἔχων κτλ <sup>18</sup>). All this is to a great extent allegorical interpretation, which is hardly very early, but the following passage of the often quoted  
 25 mythographer of Diodoros (4, 4, 1) about the early Dionysos Sabazios perhaps throws some light on Ph. and on what Eusebios calls the αἰσχροὶ αἰτίαι: οὗ τὴν τε γένεσιν καὶ τὰς θυσίας καὶ τιμὰς νυκτερινὰς καὶ κρυφίους παρεισάγουσι διὰ τὴν αἰσχύνην τὴν ἐκ τῆς συνουσίας ἐπακολουθοῦσαν. We are handicapped in all directions by our ignorance of early theology, but the  
 30 identification of Sabazios with Dionysos is universal <sup>19</sup>), and the former is important also in Athens <sup>20</sup>). Even if he was not accepted into the cult of the State Ph. must have known about him, and in any case the analogy of the ἄργια remains. An explanation of the μιξόθηλος στρατός which is essentially different and not actually theological <sup>21</sup>) is transferred by  
 35 the same mythographer (Diodor. 4, 4, 2) to the later Dionysos: καὶ τὸν μὲν ἐκ Σεμέλης γενόμενον ἐν τοῖς νεωτέροις χρόνοις φασι τῷ σώματι γενέσθαι τρυφερόν καὶ παντελῶς ἀπαλόν, εὐπρεπεῖαι δὲ πολὺ τῶν ἄλλων διενεργεῖν, καὶ πρὸς τὰς ἀφροδισιακὰς ἡδονὰς εὐκατάφορον γεγονέναι, κατὰ δὲ τὰς στρατείας γυναικῶν πλῆθος περιάγεσθαι καθωπλισμένων <sup>22</sup>) λόγχαῖς τεθυρωμέναις. In

his greatly abbreviated survey on the *ἑπωνυμῖαι* (4, 5, 2) some authors explain *δίμορφος*<sup>23</sup>) by the fact that the earlier Dionysos was represented with a beard *διὰ τοὺς ἀρχαίους πάντας πωγωνιοτροφεῖν*, the later *ὠραῖος καὶ τρυφερὸς καὶ νέος*. The passage Diod. 4, 4, 4 also appeals to the representations in art, which are adduced here to support the identification with Helios<sup>24</sup>) from the *puerilis* down to the *senilis aetas*. It is possible that *Bibl.* 3, 28<sup>25</sup>) (the story that Dionysos was brought up by Ino and Athamas ὡς κόρη) is also meant as an explanation.

(8-10) See in addition F 102. I grouped these fragments together because they refer to the cult of Athene and the Panathenaia; F 102 evidently belongs in the same context. Ph.'s description of the festival and its customs went into details like the narrative of the civilising activity of Kekrops (F 94/8), but all we have are some scraps. F 8/9 do not absolutely prove that Ph. followed the earlier tradition of the *Atthides* which regarded Erichthonios, the (foster)son of the goddess<sup>1</sup>), as the founder of the Panathenaia<sup>2</sup>), for in Harpokration s.v. *Παναθήναια* Ph.'s name is lacking, and Istros (334 F 4, quoted in the same article) knows Athenaia instituted by Erichthonios (or Theseus) as the first stage in the history of the 'festival of all Athenians'. It is uncertain whether this compromise belongs to as late an author as Istros, and it is even more uncertain whether (if it is earlier) Ph. created it. The Eumolpos War between Athens and Eleusis (F 13) does not favour this possibility decisively, nor does the fact that Kekrops was ruler of all Attica (F 94) decisively contradict it, for according to Thukydides 2, 15, 1, who was well known to Ph.<sup>3</sup>), the rulers of the twelve towns ὅποτε μὴ τι δείσειαν, οὐ ξυνηῖσαν βουλευσόμενοι ὡς τὸν βασιλέα κτλ.<sup>4</sup>).

(8) Hesych. s.v. *κανηφόροι*; Lex. rhet. p. 270, 32 Bkr (Phot. s.v.); Michaelis *Parthenon* p. 329; Mittelhaus *RE* X col. 1862 ff.; Pomtow on *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 696. ἐν ἀξιώματι.] Hesych. s.v. αἱ ἀσται καὶ εὐγενεῖς (Lex. rhet. l.c.); αἱ εὐγενεῖς παρθένοι Schol. Aristoph. *Ach.* 242; [*κανηφόροι* · αἶδε ἐκ - ]ντιδῶν ('videtur esse nomen gentis' Pomtow) *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 711 E (106/5 B.C.). Παναθηναίους] Their importance in this place is shown by the decree about the Panathenaia of the administration of Lykurgos *IG*<sup>2</sup> II 334 a. 335/4 B.C., where portions of the sacrificial meat are apportioned to the prytaneis, archons, treasurers of the goddess, hieropoioi, strategoi, taxiarchs, καὶ τοῖς πομπεῦσι τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις καὶ τα[ῖς κανηφόροις] κατὰ τὰ εἰωθότα; cf. also παρασκευάσας τῇ θεῷ κόσμον . . . καὶ κόσμον χρυσοῦν εἰς ἑκατὸν κανηφόρους in the honorary decree for Lykurgos *Vit. X or.* 852 C (*IG*<sup>2</sup> II 457; Pausan. I, 29, 16), and *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 718 (98/7 B.C.)

about the maidens who had worked at the peplos and participated in the πομπή. Concerning Oreithyia as κανηφόρος see on F 111. ἄλλαις πομπαιῖς] Schol. Aristoph. *Ach.* 242 κατὰ τὴν τῶν Διονυσίων ἑορτὴν παρὰ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις αἱ εὐγενεῖς παρθέναι ἐκανηφόρου· ἦν δὲ ἐκ χρυσοῦ πεπονημένα τὰ 5 κανῶ, ἐφ' ὧν τὰς ἀπαρχὰς ἀπάντων ἐτίθησαν. In the honorary decree for the performance of the Great Dionysia in the year of Nikias I G<sup>3</sup> II 668 (284/3 B.C. ?), the father τῆς κανηφόρου closes the list of persons commended. Kanephoroi in varying numbers appear in the inscriptions relating to the Pythais of the years 138/7 B.C. ff. (*Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 696 C; 711 C; 728 C). 10 About kanephoroi at the Brauronia see on F 101; for Zeus and other gods Mittelhaus *l.c.* col. 1865 f.

(9) Et. M. p. 441, 51 θαλλοφόρος· ὁ πομπέων Ἀθήνησι τοῖς Παναθηναίοις καὶ ἑλαίας κλάδος φέρων. Eustath. *Od.* ζ 152 καὶ θαλλοφόροι δὲ τινες ἦσαν ἐν Ἀθήναις· τοιοῦτοι δὲ ἐν τισιν ἑορταῖς οἱ γεραίτατοι. Xenophon *Symp.* 15 4, 17 provides the supplement (interesting also in regard to the qualification required of the κανηφόροι) that the Athenians θαλλοφόρους τῆι Ἀθηναῖ τοὺς καλοὺς γέροντας ἐκλέγονται. How the selection was made, and whether there were any other conditions, we do not know; I find the wide-spread explanation of the εὐανδρίας ἀγών (F 102) very doubtful. 20 The θαλλοί which the old men carried in their hands (?) <sup>1</sup>) were olive branches because for the gift of the olive Athene competes with Demeter and Dionysos; the grammarians note as specifically Athenian that θαλλός without an addition means an olive branch <sup>2</sup>). There is an isolated note in *Lex. rhet.* p. 242, 3 Bkr δρῦν φέρειν διὰ τῆς ἀγορᾶς· τὸ τοὺς ἀπελευθερωθέντας δούλους καὶ ἄλλους βαρβάρους κλάδον δρυὸς ἕκαστον διὰ τῆς ἀγορᾶς ἐν τῆι τῶν Παναθηναίων ἑορτῆι φέρειν; perhaps we may compare the σκαφηφορία, ὕδριαφορία, σκιαδηφορία of the metic women and girls. About Oschophoroi (F 16) and other θαλλοφορίαί see Tresp *RE V A 1*, 1934, col. 1215 f.

30 (10) *Lex. rhet.* p. 254, 11 Bkr: ἐπίβοιον· τὸ ἐπὶ τῆι θυομένηι βοί θυόμενον. To decide between the readings Πανδρόσωι and Πανδώραι is not quite so easy here as in the Suda s.v. προτόνιον (from the *Synagoge*) where Πανδώρα is a mistake made by lexicographer himself instead of Πάνδροσος preserved by Photios. But material reasons tell in favour of Kekrops' daughter 35 in this instance too because she is so closely connected with Athene <sup>1</sup>) that the goddess herself is worshipped as Ἀθηναῖ Πάνδροσος <sup>2</sup>). Moreover, there is no evidence for the cult of Pandora in Athens: the fictitious oracle of Bakis (Aristoph. *Ach.* 971) πρῶτων Πανδώραι θῆσαι λευκότριχα κρόν, where the Scholia explain τῆι Γῆι, does not prove it, and the Ge



of the Akropolis has the epithet *Καρποφόρος* <sup>3)</sup>. The name of the so-called Pandora of the drinking-bowl of Nola, who is adorned by Athena and Hephaistos, is ('Α)νησιδώρα, and Demeter is worshipped by that name together with *Κόρη Πρωτογόνη* at Phlius and Myrrhinus <sup>4)</sup>. The fact <sup>5</sup> that Phanodemos (325 F 4) can mention among the daughters of Erechtheus Protogeneia and Pandora as those who sacrificed themselves for Athens also seems to tell against a cult of Pandora. We do not know whether Ph. gave them the same names, but for him the daughters of Erechtheus belong to Dionysos and receive *νηφάλια* (F 12). That Ge, <sup>10</sup> Demeter, Pandora, Anesidora essentially resemble each other does not concern textual criticism <sup>5)</sup>, and Stengel <sup>6)</sup> rightly warned us against finding the ritual prescription parallel to F 10 in Suda s.v. *Κουροτρόφος γῆ· ταύτη δὲ θῦσαι φασὶ πρῶτον Ἐριχθόνιον ἐν ἀκροπόλει καὶ βωμῶν ἰδρύσασθαι, χάρις ἀποδιδόντα τῇ Γῆι τῶν τροφείων· καταστῆσαι δὲ νόμιμον τοὺς θύοντάς* <sup>15</sup> *τινι θεῷ, ταύτη προθύειν*. It is more likely that this information was taken from an *Atthis* than from a book *Περὶ θυσιῶν*, for it refers to the story of Erechthonios' birth. We need not enter into the speculations of Spengel about this preliminary sacrifice <sup>7)</sup>, for even if we agree with A. Mommsen <sup>8)</sup> in replacing *τινι θεῷ* by *τῇ θεῷ* (*i.e.* Athene), this is still an <sup>20</sup> offering to *Κουροτρόφος*, who is not Anesidora or Pandora <sup>9)</sup>. Only the position in the *Atthis* of F 10 remains uncertain: cow and sheep are the sacrificial animals for Athene also at the Panathenaia <sup>10)</sup>, but the ritual prescription does not look very much like the description of a festival. It is perhaps more probable that Ph. supplied the aition for the special <sup>25</sup> prescription (as the author of the Suda did for the preliminary sacrifice to Ge), and in that case we may connect F 10 with F 105/6 and the story of the daughters of Kekrops, which then stood in the second book <sup>11)</sup>.

(11) *Palaiaphatos Π. Ἄπ. 22 Ζήτης καὶ Κάλαις . . . Βορέου δὲ παῖδες (ἀνδρός, οὐκ ἀνέμου) βοηθήσαντες αὐτῷ (scil. τῷ Φινεΐ). Schol. Apoll. Rhod. 1,* <sup>30</sup> *211/5c Ἡραγόρας δὲ ἐν τοῖς Μεγαρικοῖς (486 F 3) τὸν τὴν Ὠρείθυιαν ἀρπάσαντα Βορέαν υἱὸν Στρυμόνος φησὶν, οὐχὶ δὲ τὸν ἄνεμον. Eustath. (Schol.) Dionys. Per. 423 Βορέας δὲ οὗτος βασιλεὺς ἦν Θράκιος, ἀρπαξ Ἄττικου τούτου γυναικοῦ βασιλικῶ, εἰ καὶ ὁ μῦθος διὰ τὴν ὁμωνυμίαν ἀπαναστήσας τῆς γῆς τὸν ἀνθρώπων ἐξημέωσε· καθὰ καὶ Ἀιδωνεύς (see F 18) βασιλεὺς μὲν ἦν,* <sup>35</sup> *ὡς οἱ ἀκριβέστεροί φασιν, Ἡπείρου τῆς ἐν Μολοττοῖς, πρὸς δὲ καὶ Πειρίθου ἦλθε καὶ Θησεὺς διὰ Περσεφόνην, ἀλλὰ δὴ καὶ ὁ Ἡρακλῆς διὰ τὸν Κέρβερὸν κίνα πολλοῦ ἄξιον· ὅμως δὲ καὶ ἐκεῖνος ὁ Ἀιδωνεύς δι' ὁμοιότητα κλήσεως εἰς τὸν Ἄιδην μεταλαμβάνεται, καὶ εἰς τὸν ὑπὸ γῆν τοῖς μυθογράφοις μετατίθεται Πλούτωνα.* In this instance we accidentally are in possession

of even earlier evidence, *viz.* Plato's (Phaidr. 229) attack on the ἀγροϊκός τις σοφία and the hesitant attitude of Herodotos (7, 189) towards the Ἑλλήνων λόγος and what οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι λέγουσιν. If Oreithyia really was the gale on Brilettos, the 'windsbraut', before she was made the daughter of an Attic king <sup>1</sup>) this is a typical case of the beginning of rationalization: for not until the act (natural to folk-lore) of naming and thus personifying what is non-personal has been performed, do the difficulties arise which gradually lead to explaining it away or re-explaining it. In comparison with the method of explaining away <sup>2</sup>)—εἶτα σοφίζομενος φαίην αὐτὴν πνεῦμα βορέου κατὰ τῶν πλησίον πετρῶν σὺν Φαρμακείαι <sup>3</sup>) παίζουσαν ὄσαι, καὶ οὕτω δὴ τελευτήσασαν λεχθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ Βορέου ἀνάρπαστον γεγόνεσθαι — the rationalism of Ph. (here as *e.g.* in F 104) is moderate and limited to a detail, if an important one: the divine Boreas becomes the Thracian man who, after having become human, must have a father, to the invention of whom Ph. devoted no greater imagination than was shown by Heragoras—provided that Astraios is from Ph., which is quite uncertain <sup>4</sup>). We should like to know whether Ph. counted this Boreas among the Thracians of Eumolpos, thus giving a consistent account of the daughters of Erechtheus (see F 12). A feature in a *ιστορία* <sup>5</sup>), uncertain as to its origin but surely Athenian, represents the rape of Oreithyia as occurring when her father Erechtheus κοσμήσας ποτὲ πέμπει κανηφόρον θύσουσαν εἰς τὴν ἀκρόπολιν τῆι Πολιάδι Ἀθηναῖι. There one thinks of the Panathenaia <sup>6</sup>) and notes the resemblance to the rape of the εἰς Βραυρωῶνα κανηφόροι παρθένοι by the Pelasgians (F 101). Particulars are lacking: we do not know whether Ph. knew of issue from the marriage of Boreas and Oreithyia <sup>7</sup>), nor whether, and if so to what place <sup>8</sup>), the Thracian carried the maiden, nor where Ph. localized the rape <sup>9</sup>). But it does seem certain that according to him, too, Oreithyia was a daughter of Erechtheus, as she was in the *Atthis* of Phanodemos (325 F 4); in the Ἑλλήνων λόγος Hdt. 7, 189; in Simonides; Kallimachos F 321 Pf.; Apoll. Rhod. 1, 212; Bibl. 3, 199; *al.* There is actually no certain variant: the lemma of the Apollonios Scholion Κέκροπος δὲ Κρέουσα, Ὀρειθῖα, Πρόκρις is corrupt <sup>10</sup>); the Macedonian pedigree (n. 4) deliberately moves the facts back in time. When on the only *deinos* that carries an inscription <sup>11</sup>) Kekrops and his daughters are present beside Boreas, Erechtheus and Oreithyia, Kekrops certainly means the first king, not the son of Erechtheus Kekrops II, who was not yet known when the bowl was painted: the painter may well have assumed that the daughters of Kekrops were playmates of Oreithyia, for Kekrops was for him the immediate predecessor of Erech-

theus; but the very fact that Erechtheus himself is also present shows that this painting does not imply a divergent tradition about the father of Oreithyia. It does not even indicate with certainty that groups of Παρθένοι were not yet distinguished as Attidography tried to distinguish them after the list of kings was established<sup>12</sup>). Oreithyia had her separate fate even when the Παρθένοι, not yet differentiated, sacrificed themselves for their country.

(12) An analysis of the learned Scholion shows at once that the two fragments 12 and 194, which the editors hitherto have treated as a unity, are taken from different contexts. A few words of the connecting sentence have dropped out<sup>1</sup>), but can easily be supplied. When the grammarian (certainly Didymos) commented on the Sophoclean verse which only refers to the Eumenides<sup>2</sup>), he emptied out his box of notes on the word νηφάλιος<sup>3</sup>) and quoted Ph. twice: (1) together with Polemon for the gods to whom νηφάλια were offered (F 12); (2) together with Krates of Athens, who wrote a book Περὶ τῶν Ἀθήνησι θυσιῶν (no. 362), for the notion νηφάλια ξύλα (F 194). In F 194 it seems certain from ὁ δὲ Φιλόχορος ἀκριβέστερόν φησι that Didymos corrected Krates (probably the latest treatise on the subject) from Ph., presumably using the homonymous work of the latter Περὶ θυσιῶν which must have contained a discussion of the notion. The same relation exists between the authors quoted in F 12: Polemon did not supply the quotation from the second book of the *Atthis*, but Didymos supplemented Polemon's list of seven gods arranged in groups from Ph. who had treated in detail the νηφάλιοι θυσίαι for Dionysos and the daughters of Erechtheus<sup>4</sup>). Where and how, it is difficult to tell. The conjunction τε καὶ makes a common sacrifice seem likely, and one might suggest at first sight an aitiological account and the war with Eumolpos (F 13). F 105, where it is uncertain how far the quotation from Ph. extends, cannot be used against the suggestion. It is more serious that our tradition does not know Dionysos in the story of Erechtheus either in this connexion or elsewhere; it hardly yields anything beyond the fact that the original Παρθένοι were subject to widely divergent interpretations, and it is at least conceivable that Ph. gave variants or discussed the question systematically. Phanodemos (F 4) identified with the daughters of Erechtheus the Παρθένοι Ὑακινθίδες, and as these are sometimes identified with the Ὑάδες, the nurses of Dionysos, there might actually be a way leading from this tale to the connexion in F 12<sup>5</sup>). But Robert's interpretation<sup>6</sup>) of an Attic pelike from Kerch and his inference from the combination of Euripides' *Erechtheus* F 357 N<sup>2</sup>

and Ph. 'that the Erechthides, having become Hyades, had the very same office in Athens as elsewhere, viz. the attendance on, and nursing of, the child Dionysos' is very doubtful. It is almost as uncertain whether Ph. can have known the alleged connexion<sup>7)</sup> between the Lacedaemonian  
 5 Hyakinthos and the Attic Hyakinthides. After all, Ph. at the most only gives us the fact of a common sacrifice to Dionysos and the daughters of Erechtheus (which cannot very well be doubted), but it is impossible to state whether this was an essential feature of the account of the reign of Erechtheus, or a casual remark belonging to the digression about  
 10 Dionysos (F 5-7) meant to characterize the god. In view of Plutarch. *De tuend. san.* 19 p. 132 E καὶ γὰρ αὐτῶι τῶι Διονύσῳι πολλάκις νηφάλια θύομεν, ἐθιζόμενοι καλῶς μὴ ζητεῖν αἶε τὸν ἄκρατον it seems possible that Ph. established a connexion between the inventor of mixing the wine (F 5) and the receiver of wine-less sacrifices (F 12 with a definite ritual  
 15 fact, where Plutarch has a vague πολλάκις).

(13) The aitiological legend connects the Boedromia festival with the assistance given to the Athenians by Ion in the war with Eumolpos. The author *Περὶ μηνῶν* (or *Περὶ ἑορτῶν*) used in *Et. Gen.* s.v. *Βοηδρομιῶν*<sup>1)</sup> does the same. But there is a difference in the etymological explanation:  
 20 Ph. derives the name of the festival directly from an old word βοηδρομεῖν = βοηθεῖν (found in Tragedy), stressing its second component δρομεῖν (θεῖν) and thus getting the meaning 'help with great speed' (μετὰ σπουδῆς παραγίνεσθαι Hesych. s.v. βοηδρομεῖν); the source of the *Et. Gen.* finds the (battle-)cry in the composite word and thus derives  
 25 it ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ στρατεύματος βοῆς τῆς ἐπὶ τῶι ἄστει δραμούσης. As Ph. dates the war under Erechtheus, the story of Demeter must have preceded; and as he has not written a special book on Eleusis (as Melanthios did) he cannot have recorded this story, which played an important part in every *Attis*, quite summarily. But the very scanty remains (F 103/4)  
 30 preserved seem to imply that he did not mention much special, or remote, tradition and that he probably did not develop an own conception of the deity, as he did in the case of Dionysos (F 5/7). It may remain an open question whether the mantis of the State was less interested on principle in the Eleusinian cult than Melanthios, who perhaps was ἐξηγη-  
 35 τῆς ἐξ Εὐμόλπιδων. In any case, it would be to no purpose to present the whole tradition on Eleusis, which is voluminous but uniform as to the main facts. Instead we shall set forth clearly the questions arising from F 13<sup>2)</sup>, not obscuring them by preconceived ideas or by interposing the general tradition: (1) In Ph.'s record, what was the relation (if any)

between the assistance given by Ion and the sacrifice of the daughters of Kekrops or Erechtheus (F 105)? These two motifs originally exclude each other, and it may be inferred that Ph. had more to say about Ion than is preserved in this fragment. (2) Did there exist, besides his aition, another which connected the Boedromia with the Amazon War of Theseus? The passage in Plutarch *Theos*. 27, 2—ἡ μὲν οὖν μάχη Βοηδρομιῶνος ἐγένετο μνηδὸς † ἐφ' ἧι τὰ Βοηδρόμια μέχρι νῦν Ἀθηναῖοι θύουσιν—is not an altogether safe foundation for this (fairly general) assumption, because the text seems to be corrupt<sup>3)</sup>. Apparently Plutarch merely determined the date of the Amazon battle by the Boedromia festival, the date of which is lacking in F 13; and as Boedromion seems to have been generally the Athenian month for celebrating victories<sup>4)</sup> the note does not seem to be of chronological, but only of heortological, value: the god to whom Theseus sacrifices is not Apollo Boedromios but Phobos. The existence of a second aition might be inferred with more probability from Macrobius. *Sat.* I, 17, 18 *hanc vocem, id est τὴ Παιάν, confirmasse fertur oraculum Delphicum Atheniensibus petentibus opem dei adversus Amazonas Theseo regnante; namque inuituros bellum iussit his ipsis verbis semet ipsum auxiliatorem invocare hortarique*, and from Schol. Kallimach. *Hymn.* 2, 69 ὦ πολλον, πολλοὶ σε Βοηδρόμιον καλέουσι] πολέμου ἐπελθόντος τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ἔχρησεν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς μετὰ βοῆς ἐπιθέσθαι τοῖς πολεμίοις· οἱ δὲ τοῦτο ποιήσαντες ἐνίκησαν, ἔθεν Βοηδρόμιος Ἀπόλλων. The former quotation, however, which reached Macrobius through Apollodoros<sup>5)</sup>, does not deal with Βοηδρόμιος but with Παιάν; and the latter does not mention either Theseus or the war with the Amazons. On the other hand, in F 13 Apollon as the deity of the festival is omitted, and it is not safe to supply him in Ph. relying only on the idea that the Apollon Βοηδρόμιος<sup>6)</sup> cannot be separated from the Βοηδρόμια; for Ph. derives the name of the festival from the βοηδρομεῖν of Ion, who (as is understandable from his manner of rationalism; cp. F 11) is for him the son of Xuthos, not of Apollo (see *infra*). (3) The suggestion which connects the Boedromia legend with the battle of Marathon<sup>7)</sup> where the Athenians δρόμωι ἔντο ἐς τοὺς βαρβάρους<sup>8)</sup> is very doubtful. Here again the sixth of Boedromion—the day after the Genesia, the general Athenian festival of the dead—has none but heortological importance<sup>9)</sup>: it is the day of Artemis; it is to Artemis that the polemarch makes his vow; and it is Enyalios who is associated with her, not Apollo Boedromios<sup>10)</sup>. Moreover, for Ph. βοηδρομεῖν does not mean the charge of an attacking army, the μετὰ βοῆς ἐπιθέσθαι, but βοηθεῖν πολλῇι σπουδῇι. That is first and foremost merely

an etymology which does not surprise us in a scholar; but it is only natural that Ph. connected it with an event in the mythical history of Athens. There is not the least resemblance to the historical event at Marathon, and a method of research which conversely explains the historical event as an invention from the Boedromia legend or the Boedromia customs (which we do not know) is in my opinion completely wrong. If according to Ph. Ion comes to the help of the Athenians the methodical question has to be: where does he come from? The answer to this, and moreover the context in which the explanation of the Boedromia occurred in Ph., are supplied by Strabo 8, 7, 1: Xuthos, the son of Hellen, τὴν Ἐρεχθέως θυγατέρα γήμας ὤκισε τὴν Τετράπολιν τῆς Ἀττικῆς· Οἰνόν, Μαραθῶνα, Προβάλινθον καὶ Τρικόρυθον; of his sons Achaios fled to the Peloponnese and became eponymous king of the Achaeans, Ἴων δὲ τοὺς μετ' Εὐμόλπου νικήσας Θραϊκῆς οὕτως ἠδδοκίμησεν ὥστ' ἐπέτρεψαν αὐτῶι τὴν πολιτείαν Ἀθηναῖοι. ὁ δὲ πρῶτον μὲν εἰς τέτταρας φυλάς διεῖλε τὸ πλῆθος, εἶτα εἰς τέτταρας βίους· τοὺς μὲν γὰρ γεωργοὺς ἀπέδειξε, τοὺς δὲ δημιουργοὺς, τοὺς δὲ ἱεροποιούς, τετάρτους δὲ τοὺς φύλακας. τοιαῦτα δὲ πλείω διατάξας τὴν χώραν ἐπάνωμον ἑαυτοῦ κατέλιπεν κτλ. This combination <sup>11</sup>) is obviously Athenian, and if Strabo (which is quite possible) excerpted Ephoros <sup>12</sup>) the latter used an Attic source, presumably Hellanikos. The version occurred in the *Atthis* of Kleidemos <sup>13</sup>) and, with more details, in one of the *Atthides* used by Aristotle: Ἀθπ. F 1 with Ἀπόλλων πατρῶιος and the πολέμαρχος Ἴων; Ἀθπ. 3, 2 ὅθεν καὶ τὸν Ἴωνα μετεπέμψαντο χρεῖας καταλαβούσης; 41, 2 πρώτη . . . μετὰστασις τῶν <sup>25</sup> ἐξ ἀρχῆς Ἴωνος καὶ τῶν μετ' αὐτοῦ συνοικησάντων· τότε γὰρ πρῶτον εἰς τὰς τέτταρας συνενεμήθησαν φυλάς, καὶ τοὺς φυλοβασιλέας κατέστησαν. Ph., who also wrote a special book about the Tetrapolis (F 73/5), must have recorded these events: the particulars escape us; it is just possible that his Ion (like the Ion of Strabo's source?), when coming to the help of the Athenians, reigned in the Tetrapolis, one of the Twelve Towns (F 94). But it seems more likely that he came from Achaia, as in Pausan. 7, 1, where he is killed in the battle and buried in the deme Potamoi. Neither from this story nor from the pre-Herodotean tradition about the στρατάρχης Ion can we draw an inference as to the age of the Boedromia legend: the aition, provided and etymologically explained by Ph., may well be that author's invention. The fact of Ion being the grandson of Erechtheus is, in view of the length of the reign of this king, as little objectionable as the trial of Alkippe under Kekrops <sup>14</sup>). Moreover, the war with Eumolpos usually means the end of Erechtheus (although not

always in the same way), and this perhaps made it possible for Ion to create the state of the four phylai and/or to decide about his successor<sup>15</sup>). Each Attidographer may have told the details differently; such divergences were probably wider and more numerous than we readily imagine.

5 But it is easily intelligible that a later forger of Attic primeval history (Pherekydes-Antiochos 333 F 2) could neglect the whole legend. [Ἴων] He is the son of Xuthos both in Ph. and in Herodotos and probably in Hellanikos-Ephoros<sup>16</sup>). Whether Aristotle (Ἀθπ. F 1) mentioned the parents of Ion we do not know; the fact that Ion introduced the Apollon Patroos is no evidence for his having regarded him as son of Apollo;

10 Schol. Aristoph. *Av.* 1537 follows Euripides with ἐξ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ Κρεούσης τῆς Εὐόθου <γυναικός>. What Ph.'s attitude towards Euripides was, or how he explained the cult of Apollon Patroos (that he explained it, may be assumed as certain), we do not know. Herodt. I, 147, 1 in the

15 definition εἰσὶ δὲ πάντες Ἴωνες ὅσοι ἀπ' Ἀθηναίων γεγόνασι καὶ Ἀπατούρια ἄγουσι ὀρθήν does not mention Ion, and Euripides, who calls Ion κτίστορ' Ἀσιάδος χθονός (*Ion* 74; but see 1581/8) does not mention the Apaturia, the reason for this being possibly that they were not established according to Athenian tradition<sup>17</sup>) until after Troy. Nor can Ph. have

20 given a different account of this festival. Εὐμόλπου — Ἐρεχθέως βασιλεύοντος] The date of the war (cf. F 105) is the usual one: Thukyd. 2, 15, 1 ἐπολέμησαν . . . καὶ Ἐλευσίνιοι μετ' Εὐμόλπου πρὸς Ἐρεχθέα; Eurip. *Erechtheus* F 362 N<sup>2</sup>; Isokr. *Panath.* 193 Θραϊκὸς μὲν γὰρ μετ' Εὐμόλπου τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος εἰσέβαλον εἰς τὴν χώραν ἡμῶν, ὃς ἡμφισβήτησεν Ἐρεχθεὶ τῆς πό-

25 λεως, φάσκων Ποσειδῶ πρότερον Ἀθηναῖς καταλαβεῖν αὐτήν; Euseb. *a. Abr.* 650 (*var.* 648 A; 642 Arm.) = 28th year of Erechtheus ὁ κατὰ Εὐμόλπον πόλεμος ἀφ' οὗ οἱ Εὐμόλπιδαι Ἀθήνησιν; and others. The autoschediasm of Alkidamas *Od.* 23—Μενεσθεὺς δὲ πρῶτος λέγεται κοσμηῆσαι τάξεις . . . ἦνικα Εὐμόλπος ὁ Ποσειδῶνος ἐπ' Ἀθηναίους ἐστράτευσε Θραϊκᾶς ἄγων —

30 is of no importance<sup>18</sup>), and we may disregard also the entry of Euseb. *a. Abr.* 684 (*var.* 683/7) which moves Ion down to the fifteenth<sup>19</sup>) year of the second Kekrops: *Ion vir fortis (gewesener feldherr der Athener Arm = στρατηγὸς γενόμενος Ἀθηναίων) ex suo vocabulo Athenienses Iones vocavit.* Incidentally, tradition equally agrees in the dating of the arrival of

35 Demeter and the establishment of the mysteries under Erechtheus: Marm. Par. 239 A 12/5; Justin. 2, 6, 12; (Hekataios of Abdera-) Diodor. I, 29, 3 ὁμολογεῖν δὲ καὶ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ὅτι βασιλεύοντος Ἐρεχθέως . . . ἢ τῆς Δήμητρος ἐγένετο παρουσία πρὸς αὐτοὺς καὶ ἡ δωρεὰ τοῦ σίτου· πρὸς δὲ τούτοις αἱ τελεταὶ καὶ τὰ μυστήρια ταύτης τῆς θεοῦ τότε κατεδείχθησαν ἐν

'Ελευσῖνι; *Bibl.* 3, 199-205; Euseb. *a. Abr.* 630 (*var.* 620/2) = beginning of Erechtheus *sub quo ei mysteria coeperunt*; and others. It is doubtful whether the dating under his predecessor Pandion <sup>20</sup>) is a real variant, or due to a later levelling process. In any case, the ζήτημα τί δήποτε

5 Εὐμόλπιδαι τῶν τελετῶν ἐξάρχουσι ξένοι ὄντες <sup>21</sup>), which was bound to arise after Eumolpos had superseded Immarados in his position as the leader of the Thracians <sup>22</sup>), is of greater importance; and so are the different combinations by which it was answered <sup>23</sup>). An agreement with the enemy, like the one Kleidemos (F 18) supplied for the war

10 with the Amazons, is conceivable but cannot be proved, and as early an author as Andron (10 F 13) made Εὐμόλπον τὸν καταδείξαντα τὴν μύσιν καὶ ἱεροφάντην γεγονότα the son of 'the poet Musaios' and the fifth descendant from the Thracian Eumolpos. This version cannot be purely Attic, for Andron derives the Kerykes and the Eumolpids from this

15 ancestor. Possibly the ἔνιοι of Istros (334 F 22) replaced the Thracian by Musaios when calling the founder of the mysteries the grandson of Triptolemos through Deiope; and the *Atthis* of the *Parian Marble* almost seems to have omitted the whole Eleusinian War <sup>24</sup>), for in its detailed group of notes <sup>25</sup>) the poet of Demeter Orpheus and the poet of the mys-

20 teries Eumolpos appear ten years after the gift of corn and after Triptolemos <sup>26</sup>). Surely Ph. must somehow have defined his view, but we cannot clearly distinguish what it was. Although in F 13 and in F 104 the Eleusinians are lacking, and although Phanodemos (325 F 4) when mentioning the sacrifice of the virgins <sup>27</sup>) speaks of 'a Boeotian war', the Eumolpos,

25 son of Poseidon, of F 13 cannot be but the Thracian, whether he be a contemporary of the Thracian ravisher of Oreithyia (F 11) or, in accordance with the accepted genealogy <sup>28</sup>), his grandson. Moreover, Ph. (F 208) makes Musaios, who when connected genealogically with Eumolpos usually is his father <sup>29</sup>), his son by Selene. We do not know whether he

30 did this in the *Atthis*, for he dealt fully with Orpheus (and therefore probably also with Musaios) in *Περὶ μαντικῆς*. In any case, this Musaios <sup>30</sup>) παραλύσεις (?) καὶ τελετὰς καὶ καθαρμούς συνέθηκεν; these τελεταὶ evidently are a book and cannot refer to the mysteries which, although they actually are τελεταὶ, are always distinguished from the καθαρμοί. For

35 instance *Marm. Par.* A 15 dates the introduction of the mysteries by Eumolpos (?) under Erechtheus, whereas it dates the first καθαρμός which is followed at a short distance by the establishment of the Eleusinian ἀγών <sup>31</sup>) about 70 years later under Pandion II, and it is not quite certain that Ph. mentioned this king at all.



(14-16) The three fragments must be treated together because to a certain degree they illuminate each other. It may appear surprising at first sight that I have placed F 16 before Theseus' expedition to Crete (F 17) and not among the fragments relating to Theseus; perhaps even more surprising that I did not assign F 183 to the *Atthis* although it deals with the deipnophoroi. I do not by any means presume that my arrangement is correct, but, as a matter of fact, none of the three fragments 14-16 contains a date, and F 14 almost certainly belongs to the reign of Erechtheus; there also are some indications that Ph. largely unraveled the complex history of Theseus as narrated in Demon's *Atthis* which immediately preceded his own <sup>1</sup>).

A new light has been thrown on Athena Skiras, and incidentally on the two festivals of the Skira and the Oskophoria, by the great inscription *Agora* Inv. I 3244 from 363/2 B.C. which contains a covenant between 15 the two branches of the 'clan' of the Salaminioi, viz. the *Σαλαμίνιοι ἐκ τῶν Ἑπταφυλῶν* and the *Σαλαμίνιοι ἀπὸ Σουλίου* <sup>2</sup>). But in using the inscription two limitations must be observed: (1) it gives numerous and detailed regulations about the cult of the clan besides a full sacrificial calendar, but it does, of course, not give a systematic description of these 20 cults and even less anything about their historical development. I give an example which concerns our fragments <sup>3</sup>): the inscription contains regulations about both the cult of Athena Skiras and the selection of the oschophoroi and deipnophoroi, but it neither mentions the name of the Oskophoria, nor does it give another name for the festival(s) of Athena 25 Skiras. It does not tell us what the oschophoroi and the deipnophoroi are, or what their business is, it does not even state expressly that they belong to the cult of A. Skiras <sup>4</sup>). All these matters belong to the background assumed to be generally known in the clan, and if we wish to form a clear idea of this background we must have recourse to conclusions 30 from, and combinations with, our literary tradition. (2) The inscription is exclusively concerned with a gentilitical cult of the Salaminioi, and the picture of this cult which we get from the inscription is uniform and on the whole also clear notwithstanding the first limitation which causes a number of questions to remain unanswered.

35 The literary tradition refers to all Attica, and not to Attica alone; it is connected with all places in which Skiras, Skiros, and Skiron appear, and with all points really or apparently related to them. It explains cultic facts and speculates on them; it is full of criticism by the Atthidographers of each other, and even more of the authors of *Megarika*. It is

the literary tradition which actually makes difficulties, and Ph. belongs to this sphere. Even apart from the particular difficulty that we are quite insufficiently informed about his doctrine (for in F 15/16 it has dropped out, and in F 14 it has been preserved in a most succinct form, and certainly not complete); and even assuming as a matter of course that he knew all particulars of the gentilitical cult of the Salaminioi, it is uncertain how far it is allowable (converting in a manner our first limitation) to use the epigraphically attested facts of the cult for restoring Ph.'s theory and the literary tradition. We cannot tell *prima facie* whether he tried to disentangle the very complex tradition by taking his departure from the clan-cult and thus to harmonize the contradictory statements, or whether he confined himself to setting out and explaining the various groups of tradition as he thought he recognized them. So far as we can decide this question of principle, everything in my opinion favours the supposition that he took the latter course<sup>5</sup>). It is at least quite certain that not only the one Skiros of Phaleron occurred in the *Atthis*<sup>6</sup>), and that we must not equate even this Skiros with the Skiros worshipped by the clan of the Salaminioi<sup>7</sup>). It is therefore our first task to establish what account Ph. gave of each individual group of traditions, and in order to do so it is necessary to present the scraps (we have no more) of the entire literary tradition about Skira and Oschophoria so far as is desirable for the comprehension of F 14-16, for the performance of the task is possible up to a point only in the context of the whole tradition<sup>8</sup>). Attention must be called to the fact that only the smallest part of the tradition can be assigned to certain authors, and that these authors, as far as they are not late heortologists, belong to the latest period of Attidography<sup>9</sup>). But it is self-evident that the facts with which these authors work, or which they try to explain, go back earlier, some of them far earlier, than even the earliest Attidographers.

30 I (F 14): 1) Phot. Suda s.v. Σκίρος<sup>10</sup>) · σκιάδειον<sup>11</sup>). <Σκίρα><sup>12</sup>) ἐορτή τις ἀγομένη τῆι Ἀθηναί, ὅτε<sup>13</sup>) σκιαδείων ἐφρόντιζον ἐν ἀκμῆι τοῦ καύματος · σκίρα δὲ τὰ σκιάδεια<sup>14</sup>). οἱ δὲ οὐ διὰ τοῦτο φασιν ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν ἀπὸ σκίρων Ἀθηναῖν, ἣν Θησεύς ἐποίησεν, ὅτε ἐπανάηει ἀποκτείνας τὸν Μινώταυρον · ἡ σκίρα δὲ ἐστὶ γῆ λευκή, ὥσπερ γύψος<sup>15</sup>). οἱ δὲ φασιν ἀπὸ Σκίρου τοῦ Ἐλευσινίου<sup>16</sup>) μάντεως γενέσθαι τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν ταύτην, ἄλλοι δὲ ἀπὸ Σκίρου τοῦ συνοικίσαντος Σαλαμίνα<sup>17</sup>). 2) Pausan. I, 36, 3 ἰούσι δὲ ἐπ' Ἐλευσίνα ἐξ Ἀθηναίων ἦν Ἀθηναῖοι καλοῦσιν Ὀδὸν Ἰεράν Ἀνθεμοκρίτου πεποιήται μνήμα. ἐς τοῦτον Μεγαρεῦσιν ἐστὶν ἀνοσιώτατον ἔργον. . . . (4) μετὰ δὲ τοῦ Ἀνθεμοκρίτου τὴν στήλην Μολοττοῦ τε τάφος . . . καὶ χωρίον

- Σκίρον<sup>18</sup>) ἐπὶ τοιῶνδε καλούμενον· Ἐλευσινίοις πολεμοῦσι πρὸς Ἐρεχθέα ἀνὴρ μάντις ἦλθεν ἐκ Δωδώνης ὄνομα Σκίρος, ὃς καὶ τῆς Σκιράδος ἰδρύσατο Ἀθηνᾶς ἐπὶ Φαληρῶν τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἱερόν· πεσόντα δὲ αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ μάχῃ θάπτουσιν Ἐλευσῖνιοι πλησίον ποταμοῦ χειμάρρου, καὶ τῷ τε χωρίῳ τὸ ὄνομα ἀπὸ τοῦ ἥρωός ἐστι καὶ τῷ ποταμῷ.
- 3) Plutarch. Thes. 10 Σκείρωνα<sup>19</sup>) δὲ πρὸ τῆς Μεγαρικῆς ἀνεῖλε (scil. Θησεύς) βίβας κατὰ τῶν πετρῶν, ὡς μὲν ὁ πολὺς λόγος ληιστεύοντα τοὺς παριόντας... (2) οἱ δὲ Μεγαροῖτες συγγραφεῖς... ληιστῶν μὲν κολαστήν, ἀγαθῶν δὲ καὶ δικαίων οἰκεῖον ἀνδρῶν καὶ φίλον. (3) Αἰακὸν τὸ γὰρ Ἑλλήνων οὐσιώτατον νομίζεσθαι, καὶ Κυγχρέα<sup>20</sup>) τιμὰς θεῶν ἔχειν Ἀθήνησιν τὸν Σαλαμῖνον... Σκείρωνα τοίνυν Κυγχρέως μὲν γενέσθαι γαμβρόν, Αἰακοῦ δὲ πενθερόν, Πηλέως δὲ καὶ Τελαμῶνος πάππον, ἐξ Ἐνδηίδος γεγονότων τῆς Σκείρωνος<sup>21</sup>) καὶ Χαριλοῦς θυγατρὸς. (4)... ἀλλὰ Θησεῖα φασὶν οὐχ ὅτε τὸ πρῶτον ἐβάδιζεν εἰς Ἀθήνας, ἀλλ' ὕστερον Ἐλευσινίᾳ τε λαβεῖν Μεγαρέων ἔχοντων, παρακρουσάμενον Διοκλέα τὸν ἄρχοντα, καὶ Σκείρωνα ἀποκτεῖναι. ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἔχει τοιαύτας ἀντιλογίας.
- 4) Pausan. 1, 39 6: Κλήσωνος δὲ τοῦ Λέλεγος γενέσθαι Πύλαν (scil. λέγουσιν οἱ Μεγαρεῖς), τοῦ Πύλα <δὲ> Σκίρωνα <τοῦτον><sup>22</sup>) συνοικῆσαι Πανδίωνος θυγατρὶ, καὶ ὕστερον Νίσωι τῷ Πανδίωνος ἐς ἀμφιβήτησιν ἔλθειν περὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς Σκίρωνα<sup>23</sup>), καὶ σφισιν Αἰακὸν δικασαί βασιλείαν μὲν δίδόντα Νίσωι καὶ τοῖς ἀπογόνους, Σκίρωι δὲ ἡγεμονίαν εἶναι πολέμου.
- 5) Strabo 9, 1, 9: ἐκαλεῖτο δ' ἐτέρως ὀνόμασι τὸ παλαιὸν (scil. ἡ Σαλαμίς)· καὶ γὰρ Σκιράς<sup>24</sup>) καὶ Κυγχρ<ε>ία<sup>25</sup>) ἀπὸ τινῶν ἡρώων· ἀφ' οὗ μὲν Ἀθηνᾶ τε λέγεται Σκιράς καὶ τόπος Σκίρα<sup>26</sup>) ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ καὶ ἐπὶ Σκίρωι<sup>27</sup>) ἱεροποιία τις καὶ ὁ μὲν ὁ Σκιροφοριῶν, ἀφ' οὗ δὲ καὶ Κυγχρειδῆς<sup>28</sup>) ὄφισ ὃν φησιν Ἡσίοδος (F 107 Rz) τραφέντα ὑπὸ Κυγχρέως ἐξελαθῆναι ὑπὸ Εὐρύλοχου<sup>29</sup>) λυμαινόμενον τὴν νῆσον, ὑποδέξασθαι δὲ αὐτὸν τὴν Δήμητραν εἰς Ἐλευσίνα, καὶ γενέσθαι ταύτης ἀμφίπολον.
- 6) Steph. Byz. s.v. Σκίρος<sup>30</sup>)· Ἀρκαδίας κατοικία... ἐστὶ καὶ ἕτερον Σκίρον τόπος Ἀττικὸς<sup>31</sup>)· καὶ Σκιρωνίδες πέτραι ἀπὸ Σκίρωνος· ἢ οὕτως<sup>32</sup>) μὲν ἀπὸ τόπου, ὁ τόπος δὲ ἀπὸ Σκίρου ἥρωος. ἐν δὲ τῷ τόπῳ τοῦτοι αἱ πόρται ἐκαθέζοντο· ἰσως δὲ καὶ τὸ σκιραφεῖον<sup>33</sup>), ὅπερ δηλοῖ τὸν τόπον εἰς ὃν οἱ κυβερταὶ<sup>34</sup>) σὺνίαισι· καὶ ὁ σκιροφόρος<sup>35</sup>), ὃ σημαίνει τὸν ἀκόλαστον καὶ κυβερτῆν<sup>36</sup>), ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν Σκίρωι<sup>37</sup>) διατριβόντων. Σκίρα δὲ κέκληται τινὲς μὲν ὅτι ἐπὶ Σκίρωι<sup>38</sup>) Ἀθήνησι<sup>39</sup>) θύεται, ἄλλοι δὲ <ὅτι> ἀπὸ τῶν γινομένων ἱερῶν Δήμητρι καὶ Κόρῃ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ ταύτῃ Ἐπίσκιρα (?) κέκληται<sup>40</sup>). λέγεται καὶ ὁ Σκίρος<sup>41</sup>) καὶ τὸ Σκίριον. βαρύνεται δέ.
- 7) Lex. rhet. p. 300, 23 Bkr (Et. M. p. 717 28,): Σκειραφεῖά ἐστι τὰ κυβεῖα, ἧτοι ἐπεὶ σκεῖραφός τις ἐστὶν ὄργανον κυβευτικόν<sup>42</sup>), ἢ ἀπὸ Σκειράφου πινὸς κυβευτοῦ, ἢ ὅτι ἐν τῷ τῆς Σκειράδος Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερῷ οἱ κυβερταὶ ἐπαιζον, ἕξω τῆς πόλεως ὄντι<sup>43</sup>).
- 8) Schol. Aristoph. Eccl. 18 ὅσα Σκίροις ἐδοξε ταῖς ἐμαῖς φίλαις Σκίρα ἑορτὴ ἐστὶ τῆς Σκιράδος Ἀθηνᾶς, Σκιροφοριῶνος ἴβ· οἱ δὲ Δήμητρον<sup>44</sup>) καὶ Κόρη. ἐν τῇ ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῦ Ἐρεχθέως φέρει σκιάδειον λευκόν, ὃ λέγεται σκίρον.
- 9) Schol. Aristoph. Thesm. 834 Στηνίοισι καὶ Σκίροις] ἀμφότεραι ἑορταὶ γυναικῶν· τὰ μὲν Στήνια πρὸ δυεῖν τῶν Θεσομοφοριῶν Πυαναεψιδῶνος θ, τὰ δὲ Σκίρα λέγεσθαι φασὶ τινὲς <διά>τὰ γινόμενα ἱερά ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ ταύτῃ Δήμητρι καὶ Κόρῃ, οἱ δὲ ὅτι Ἐπίσκιρα (?) θύεται τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ<sup>45</sup>).
- 10) Schol. Clem. Al. Protrept. 2, 17 p. 302, 18 St. Σκιροφορία ἑορτῆς ὄνομα ἐπιτελου-

μένης<sup>46</sup>) τῇ Ἀθηναίᾳ διὰ Σκίρωνα τὸν λυμαινόμενον πᾶσι τοῖς παρ' αὐτὸν καταίρουσιν . . . ἀναιρεθέντα δὲ ὑπὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς. 11) (a) Clem. Al. *Protrept.*

- 2, 17, 1 βούλει καὶ τὰ Φερεφάττης ἀνθολόγια διηγήσομαι σοι<sup>47</sup>) καὶ τὸν κάλαθον καὶ τὴν ἀρπαγὴν τὴν ὑπὸ Ἀιδωνέως καὶ τὸ χάσμα<sup>48</sup>) τῆς γῆς καὶ τὰς ὕς τὰς Εὐβουλέως τὰς συγκαταποθείσας ταῖν θεαῖν<sup>49</sup>), δι' ἣν αἰτίαν ἐν τοῖς Θεσμοφορίοις μεγαρίζοντες<sup>50</sup>) χοίρους ἐμβάλλουσιν; ταύτην τὴν μυθολογίαν αἱ γυναῖκες ποικίλως κατὰ πόλιν ἐορτάζουσι, Θεσμοφορία, Σκιροφορία, <Ἀρρητοφορία><sup>51</sup>), πολυτρόπως τὴν Φερεφάττης ἐκτραγωιδῶσαι ἀρπαγὴν. (b) Schol. Lucian. p. 275, 23 R: Θεσμοφορίοις] Θεσμοφορία ἐορτὴ Ἑλλήνων μυστήρια περιέχουσα. // τὰ δὲ αὐτὰ καὶ Σκιροφορία καλεῖται. // ἤγετο δὲ κατὰ τὸν μυθωδέστερον λόγον, ὅτι <δτε><sup>52</sup>) ἀνθολογοῦσα ἠρπάζετο ἡ Κόρη ὑπὸ τοῦ Πλούτωνος, τότε κατεκείνον τὸν τόπον Εὐβουλέως τις συμβώτης ἐνεμεν ὕς, καὶ συγκατεπόθησαν τῷ χάσματι τῆς Κόρης<sup>53</sup>). εἰς οὖν τιμὴν τοῦ Εὐβουλέως ῥιπτεῖσθαι τοὺς χοίρους εἰς τὸ χάσματα τῆς Δήμητρος καὶ τῆς Κόρης. τὰ δὲ σαπέντα τῶν ἐμβληθέντων εἰς τὰ μέγαρα κάτω ἀναφέρουσι ἀντλήτριαι καλούμεναι γυναῖκες καθαρεύσασαι τριῶν ἡμερῶν . . . καὶ ἀνενέγκασαι ἐπιτιθέασιν ἐπὶ τῶν βωμῶν, ὧν νομίζουσι τὸν λαμβάνοντα καὶ τῷ σπόρῳ συγκαταβάλλοντα εὐφορίαν ἔξεν<sup>54</sup>) (expulsion or appeasement of the guarding δράκοντες by noise and τὰ πλάσματα ἐκεῖνα) . . . // τὰ δ' αὐτὰ καὶ Ἀρρητοφορία καλεῖται καὶ ἔγεται τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον ἔχοντα περὶ τῆς τῶν καρπῶν γενέσεως καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων σποράς. ἀναφέρονται δὲ κἀνταῦθα ἄρρητα ἱερά<sup>55</sup>) ἐκ στέατος τοῦ σίτου κατεσκευασμένα, μμῆματα δρακόντων καὶ ἀνδρείων σχημάτων. // λαμβάνουσι δὲ κώνου θαλλοὺς διὰ τὸ πολυγονοῦν τοῦ φυτοῦ. ἐμβάλλονται δὲ καὶ εἰς τὰ μέγαρα . . . καὶ χοῖροι, ὡς ἦδη ἔφαμεν, καὶ αὐτοὶ διὰ τὸ πολυτόκον εἰς σύνθημα τῆς γενέσεως τῶν καρπῶν καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων οἶον χαριστήρια τῇ Δήμητρι, ἐπειδὴ τοὺς Δημητρίους καρποὺς παρέχουσα ἐποίησεν ἡμερον τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος. ὁ μὲν οὖν ἔνω τῆς ἐορτῆς λόγος ὁ μυθικός, ὁ δὲ προκειμένος φυσικός. Θεσμοφορία δὲ καλεῖται καθότι Θεσμοφόρος ἡ Δημήτηρ κατονομάζεται τιθεῖσα νόμους ἤτοι θεσμούς, καθ' οὓς τὴν τροφὴν πορίζεσθαι τε καὶ κατεργάζεσθαι ἀνθρώπους δέον<sup>56</sup>).

- II (F 15-16): 1) Schol. Nikand. *Alex.* 109 ὄσχοφοροί<sup>57</sup>) δὲ λέγονται Ἀθηνησι παῖδες ἀμφιθαλεῖς ἀμιλλώμενοι κατὰ φυλάς, οἱ λαμβάνοντες κλήματα ἀμπέλου ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ Διονύσου ἔτρεχον εἰς τὸ τῆς Σκιράδος<sup>58</sup>) Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερόν. 2) Proklos *Chrest.* (Phot. *Bibl.* 239 p. 332 a 13<sup>59</sup>)) ὡσχοφορικά δὲ μέλη παρ' Ἀθηναίοις ἤϊδετο<sup>60</sup>)· τοῦ χοροῦ δὲ δύο νεανίαι, κατὰ γυναῖκας ἐστολισμένοι, κλῆμα ἀμπέλου κομίζοντες μεστὸν εὐθαλῶν βοτρυῶν (ἐχάλουν δ' αὐτὸ ὡσχην, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡ ἑπωνυμία) τῆς ἐορτῆς καθηγούντο. ἄρξαι δὲ φασὶ Ἐθυσέα πρῶτον τοῦ ἔργου· ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἐκούσιος ὑποστάς τὸν εἰς Κρήτην πλοῦν ἀπήλλαξε τὴν πατρίδα τῆς κατὰ τὸν δασμὸν συμφορᾶς, χαριστήρια ἀποδιδούς Ἀθηναίᾳ καὶ Διονύσῳ<sup>60</sup>), οἱ αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν νῆσον τὴν Δίαν ἐπεφάνησαν, ἔπραττε τοῦτο δυσὶ νεανίαις ἐσκιατραφημένοις χρησάμενος πρὸς τὴν ἱερουργίαν ὑπηρεταῖς. [[ἦν δὲ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ἡ παραπομπὴ ἐκ τοῦ Διονυσιακοῦ ἱεροῦ εἰς τὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τῆς Σκιράδος τέμενος]]. 40 εἶπετο δὲ τοῖς νεανίαις ὁ χορός, καὶ ἦϊδε τὰ μέλη. [[ἐξ ἐκάστης δὲ φυλῆς ἐφηβοὶ διημιλλῶντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους δρόμῳ, καὶ τούτων ὁ πρότερος ἐγεύετο ἐκ τῆς πενταπλῆς (sic) λεγομένης φιάλης, ἡ συνεκινῶτο ἐλαίῳ καὶ οἴνῳ καὶ μέλιτι καὶ τυρῶι καὶ ἀλίτοις]]<sup>61</sup>). 3) (a) Hesych s.v. ὡσχοι· τὰ νέα κλήματα

- σὺν αὐτοῖς τοῖς βότρουσιν. b) *Id.* s.v. 'Ωσχοφόρια<sup>62</sup>). παῖδες εὐγενεῖς ἠβῶντες καταλέγονται οἱ φέροντες τὰς ὄσχας εἰς τὸ τῆς Σκιράδος<sup>63</sup>) 'Αθηνᾶς ἱερὸν· εἰσὶ δὲ κλήματα ἔχοντα βότρυς<sup>64</sup>). c) *Id.* s.v. 'Ωσχοφόριον· τόπος 'Αθήνησι Φαληροῦ, ἔνθα τὸ τῆς 'Αθηνᾶς ἱερὸν.' 4) a) *Lex. rhet.* p. 285, 29 Bkr 'Οσχοφορία<sup>65</sup>) ὄνομά ἐστιν ἐορτῆς ἢ ὄσχοφορία, καλουμένη διὰ τοῦτο· ὄσχη<sup>66</sup>) προσαγορεύεται κληματικῆς ἐκκειμένους<sup>67</sup>) ἔχουσα τοὺς βότρυας· ταύτην εὐγενεῖς παῖδες φέρουσιν εἰς τὸ τῆς Σκιράδος 'Αθηνᾶς ἱερὸν.
- b) *Ib.* p. 318, 22 ὠσχοί· τὰ μεγάλα κλήματα σὺν αὐτοῖς τοῖς βότρουσι· καὶ ὠσχοφόροι οἱ ταῦτα τῆι Σκιεράδι 'Αθηνᾶι προσφέροντες ἐν γυναικαίαις στολαῖς
- 10 δύο νεανίαι παρὰ τοῦ Διονύσου· καὶ ἡ τῆς θεοῦ ταύτης ἐορτῆ 'Ωσχοφόρια λέγεται. c) *Ib.* p. 318, 27 'Ωσχοφόριον· τόπος 'Αθήνησιν, ἔνθα καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τῆς † 'Αρτέμιδος. 5) *Plutarch Thes.* 22, 2 καταπλέσας δ' ὁ Θησεὺς ἔθηκε μὲν αὐτὸς ἄς ἐκπλέων θυσίας εὐχάτο τοῖς θεοῖς Φαληροῖ, κήρυκα<sup>68</sup>) δ' ἀπέστειλε τῆς σωτηρίας ἀγγελον εἰς ἄστου. οὗτος ἐνέτευχεν ὀδυρομένοις τε πολλοῖς τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως (*scil.* Αἰγέως) τελευτῆν καὶ χαίρουσιν (ὡς εἰκός) ἑτέροις καὶ φιλοφρονεῖσθαι καὶ στεφανοῦν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῆς σωτηρίας προθύμοις οὔσι. (3) τοὺς μὲν οὖν στεφάνους δεχόμενος τὸ κηρύκειον ἀνέστησεν, ἐπανεβδῶν δ' ἐπὶ θάλασσαν οὕτω πεπονημένου σπονδάς τοῦ Θησεῶς ἐξω<sup>69</sup>) περιέμεινε μὴ βουλόμενος τὴν θυσίαν ταράξει. γενομένων δὲ τῶν σπονδῶν ἀπήγγειλε τὴν τοῦ Αἰγέως τελευτῆν. (4) οἱ δὲ σὺν κλαυθμῷ καὶ θορύβῳ σπεύδοντες ἀνέβαινον εἰς τὴν πόλιν· ὄθεν
- 20 καὶ νῦν ἐν τοῖς 'Ωσχοφορίαις στεφανοῦσθαι μὲν οὐ τὸν κήρυκα λέγουσιν ἀλλὰ τὸ κηρυκεῖον, ἐπιφανεῖν δ' ἐν ταῖς σπονδαῖς 'ἐλελεὺ ἰοὺ ἰοὺ' τοὺς παρόντας<sup>70</sup>). 6) *Plutarch Thes.* 23, 2 ἄγουσι δὲ καὶ τὴν τῶν 'Ωσχοφορίων ἐορτὴν Θησεῶς καταστήσαντος. (3) οὐ γὰρ ἀπάσας αὐτὸν ἐξαγαγεῖν τὰς λαχοῦσας τότε παρθένους, ἀλλὰ τῶν συνήθων νεανίσκων δύο θηλυφανεῖς μὲν ὀφθῆναι καὶ νεαρούς, ἀνδρώδεις δὲ ταῖς
- 25 ψυχαῖς καὶ προθύμοις... ἐπεὶ δ' ἐπανῆλθεν, αὐτὸν τε πομπεῖσαι καὶ τοὺς νεανίσκους οὕτως ἀμπεχομένους ὡς νῦν ἀμπέχονται τοὺς οἰσχοὺς φέροντες. (4) φέρουσι δὲ Διονύσου καὶ 'Αριάδνηι χαρίζομενοι διὰ τὸν μῦθον, ἢ μᾶλλον ὅτι συγκομιζομένης ὀπώρας ἐπανῆλθον. αἱ δὲ δειπνοφόροι παραλαμβάνονται, καὶ κοινοῦσι τῆς θυσίας ἀπομυμούμεναι τὰς μητέρας ἐκείνων τῶν λαχόντων· ἐπεφοίτων γὰρ αὐτοῖς ὄψα καὶ σιτία κομίζουσαι.
- 30 καὶ μῦθοι λέγονται διὰ τὸ κάκεινας εὐθυμίας ἔνεκα καὶ παρηγορίας μύθους διεξίναν τοῖς πασίν. ταῦτα μὲν οὖν καὶ Δήμων ((327 F 6) ἱστόρηκεν.

Lysimachides, a writer probably of the Augustan age, described the festival of the Skira in a special book about hortology. He derived the name from a typical accessory, *viz.* the great sunshade under which certain priests walked in the procession<sup>71</sup>). As the procession walked

35 ἐξ ἀκροπόλεως εἰς τινα τόπον Σκίρον the priestess of Athena mentioned in the first place must be the priestess of Athena Polias<sup>72</sup>); it is uncertain whether Athena Skiras also occurred in Lysimachides<sup>73</sup>). Ph., however, in his *Atthis* mentioned this particular Athena and, differently as to

40 the matter and as to the method, he derived her cult-name from a 'historical' founder of the cult, *viz.* the Eleusinian prophet Skiros. The extremely succinct citation of Harpokration leaves it uncertain whether

he mentioned the festival of the Skira in the same context <sup>74</sup>), but we can restore the context in which F 14 occurred in another way: (1) the lemma Σκίρων and (with greater certainty) the description of Skiros as an Eleusinian, point to the χωρίον Σκίρων treated by Pausan. 1, 36 <sup>5</sup> which was situated on the Sacred Road from Athens to Eleusis between the Thriasian gate and the Kephisos <sup>75</sup>), and this χωρίον is surely identical with the τόπος τις Σκίρων where the procession of the Skira ended. (2) This χωρίον had its name, according to Pausanias, from the prophet Skiros who came to the help of the Eleusinians in their combat against <sup>10</sup> Erechtheus, and for whom they put up a sanctuary (at the place where he fell?). Although this Skiros came from Dodona he is evidently identical with Ph.'s Eleusinian, from whom Athena Skiras had her name <sup>76</sup>), and this equation again provides a connexion with the procession of the Skira, in which the priest of (Poseidon-)Erechtheus walked at the side of the <sup>15</sup> priestess of Athena.

Ancient tradition, with which we are primarily if not solely concerned, knows four explanations for the festival of the Skira or Skirophoria <sup>77</sup>): (1) from the (φέρειν of the) σκίρων = σκιάδειον, without a date for the foundation of the festival; (2) from the (φέρειν of the) σκίρα, which are <sup>20</sup> explained as γύψος, λατύπη, γῆ λευκή, the founder of the festival being Theseus <sup>78</sup>); (3) from the Eleusinian prophet Skiros in the reign of Erechtheus; (4) from Skiros, the founder of Salamis, implying institution in primeval times. The matters which we discussed just now in order to ascertain the context in which F 14 occurred belong to the third explanation; they constitute a uniform group which localizes the festival outside <sup>25</sup> old Athens, or at least in the border-land between her and Eleusis <sup>79</sup>), connecting its institution with the war between Eleusis and the Athens of Erechtheus. The discussions as to whether the festival is in honour of Athena or of Demeter are thus proved to belong to this group <sup>80</sup>). <sup>30</sup> The aitiological legend that a prophet from Dodona came to the assistance of the Eleusinians bears the closest resemblance to the story of the Thracian Eumolpos, but gives the impression of being much older in its nucleus <sup>81</sup>), even if the Thracian was not invented as late as the fifth century as is now frequently assumed. Perhaps the abundance of the <sup>35</sup> aitiologies and their wide divergences <sup>82</sup>) can be explained by the high age and the history of the cult in the Skiron. In any case, F 14 makes it certain that it was this aitiology which Ph. accepted in the *Atthis*, and the inference therefore seems inevitable that in his opinion Athena Skiras, whose name he derived from the Eleusinian Skiros, was wor-

shipped in Skiron <sup>83</sup>). Of course, we cannot infer this from the lemma of Harpokration alone under which the quotation from Ph. occurs, perhaps not even from the fact that besides Ph. the lexicographer quotes for Athena Skiras a writer of *Megarika* who must be thinking of the Eleusinian district <sup>84</sup>). I will as yet leave aside even the Aristodemos of F 15, whose report makes Athena Skiras undisputably certain for the Skira and most probable for Ph. <sup>85</sup>). But since moreover the Schol. Aristoph. *Eccl.* 18, which belongs to the same group, calls the Skira 'a festival of Athena Skiras' <sup>86</sup>), it is really impossible to ignore all these attestations and to declare that 'the connexion of Athena Skiras with the Skirophoria is solely founded on the authority of a late, ill-informed grammarian' <sup>87</sup>).

Therefore there can be no doubt that Ph. is the authority for the version that Athena Skiras, who derives her name from Skiros, has her residence in the χωρίον Σκίρων, which equally has its name from the mantis Skiros buried there; no argument against these facts is to be drawn from the silence of Pausan. I, 36, 4 <sup>88</sup>). Pausanias is an important, perhaps the most important, witness for the Philochorean tradition about the Eleusinian Skiros, but he did not take his information directly from the *Athis*, even less from one of Ph.'s special works, but from one of his usual periegetic sources <sup>89</sup>), and we have not the least guarantee for his rendering it in full. In view of the method of Pausanias in using these sources, directly or indirectly, in describing Attica, abbreviating them, picking out details for a broader treatment without any definite principle so far as we can see, we have no reason to be surprised that although he explains the name of the district Skiron, he does not mention the Skira, or the ceremonies ἐν Σκίρωνι, or the other cults and peculiarities of the place <sup>90</sup>). Surely one must not doubt the reality of these matters because of their absence from Pausanias; the reason is simply that on the Holy Road before the crossing of the Kephisos he gives all his attention to the tombs, reporting about their occupants in more or less detail. His silence about Athena Skiras therefore does by no means allow of the inference that she was not worshipped in Skiron. What is actually surprising is not the absence of Skiras in Skiron, but the mention of Skiras in Phaleron. As we are here certainly in the domain of Philochorean tradition we conclude at first sight that this is Athena Skiras of F 14, who 'has her name from the prophet Skiros'; but the inference is probably wrong. I do not speak more confidently because the description of the sanctuary at Phaleron as τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἱερόν is not intelligible for us <sup>91</sup>), and because we are not told definitely what Ph. related about Skiras at Phaleron <sup>92</sup>); here we

come again upon our greatest difficulty, *viz.* our imperfect knowledge of the tradition in the *Atthides* and in that of Ph. in particular about the various cults of Athena: the relative clause with *καί*, which brings in Skiras of Phaleron, is very difficult to understand because we really do not see <sup>83</sup>) how the prophet, who comes to Eleusis from Dodona, and who falls fighting against Athens, can have founded a sanctuary at Phaleron <sup>84</sup>). But considering our total tradition as collected above p. 286 ff. I cannot bring myself to regard (as most scholars do after Robert <sup>85</sup>) the testimonies for Athena Skiras in the Skiron as <sup>10</sup> 'the result of a double confusion, of Athena Skiras with Athena Polias, and of the Skira (Skirophoria) at Skiron with the Skira and Skiros at Phaleron' <sup>86</sup>). If there is a confusion it was Pausanias who made it when he added to the Philochorean tradition about Skiros of Eleusis the note about Skiras of Phaleron; the relative clause with *καί* can hardly be <sup>15</sup> understood unless it is an insertion which Pausanias took either from his source or from his own knowledge of the Oschophoria at Phaleron. It seems improbable that already Ph. himself drew the connecting line between the two *Σκιράδες* (or, to put it more cautiously, between Skiros and Phaleron), if only because the fragments show for certain that he <sup>20</sup> distinguished at least two, probably three or even four, bearers of the name Skiros. He certainly knew: (1) the Eleusinian prophet of the time of Erechtheus, from whom Skiras had her name (F 14); (2) the occupant of the *ἱερόν* at Phaleron (F 111) <sup>87</sup>). He probably knew (3) the king of Salamis who furnished the navigator for Theseus' expedition to Crete <sup>25</sup> (F 111) <sup>88</sup>); (4) the primeval king of Salamis <sup>89</sup>). We can clearly distinguish in Ph. two groups of tradition, different as to locality, time, and matter: Dodona - Eleusis - Erechtheus - enemy of Athens and Salamis - Phaleron - Theseus - friend of Athens. The two groups have in common only the form of the name *Σκίρος*, which is made certain for Ph. in regard to the <sup>30</sup> Eleusinian by F 14 (and by Pausanias). It does not matter whether this was his name in cult too (we know now that it was), or whether Ph. derived the form from *ἐπὶ Σκίρωι*. But it is certain that Ph. did not wish by this name to combine him in any way with Skiros of Salamis-Phaleron; he wished rather to distinguish the Eleusinian Skiros, whom united <sup>35</sup> Athens had admitted to her cult, even by his name from the Megarian *Σκίρων*. On the contrary, the evidence collected above <sup>100</sup>) shows that the Megarian writers called the Eleusinian hero Skiron, that they claimed him for Megara, and dated him in the war between Megara and Athens about Eleusis. This tradition enables us to understand Ph.'s invention <sup>101</sup>)



of a pious prophet who came to Eleusis from Dodona: Skiros could not remain a Megarian <sup>102</sup>), and Atthidography had no use for the Salaminian as an enemy of Athens; therefore he was said to come from afar. We need not follow up here the details of the literary contest between Athens and 5 Megara; it is a parallel to that about Salamis, and may have been affected by the latter <sup>103</sup>). Nor need we discuss again the discovery made long ago that the same mythical person <sup>104</sup>) is behind all the forms in which Skiros-Skiron appears in the extensive literary tradition which in the said controversy has become even more contradictory. The value of *Agora* 3244 10 for this question consists in two points: (1) it illuminates and makes certain the fact that Skiros and Skiras belong together in cult; (2) we can now state with some certainty that at least Skiros-Skiron, but probably the divine couple as well reached Attica by two ways <sup>105</sup>): they came from Salamis to Phaleron together with the clan of the Salaminioi, and 15 they came (perhaps earlier, and perhaps from Megara <sup>106</sup>)) to Eleusis. Without following up here the history of the cults at these two points, I think that the second limitation I pointed out above <sup>107</sup>) in regard to the value of the document for the interpretation of the literary tradition is now entirely established. Our knowledge of facts referring to history 20 and to religious science, a knowledge gradually acquired and to a great extent confirmed by the document, has in a manner of speaking no bearing on the restoration of the Atthidographic records. Even the greatest expert in Attic antiquities was ignorant of the ultimate identity of Skiros of Phaleron with Skiros of Eleusis: the Eleusinian group of myths and 25 the Phalerean stand side by side unconnectedly in Ph. (and, as the great number of variants shows, elsewhere too), and even in those versions in which both have been brought into the Theseus story. If the Eleusinian Skiros as the founder of the 'ancient sanctuary of Athena Skiras at Phaleron' is not due to a confusion of Pausanias (and I cannot bring 30 myself to believe that he is) but is Philochorean tradition we cannot guess the details of the combination <sup>108</sup>). We can state with some certainty that Ph. believed the Oschophoria at Phaleron to be a festival of Athena Skiras <sup>109</sup>), and those items which we may perhaps be allowed to infer from Plutarch's *Thes.* 22 as to Ph.s description of the festival at least 35 do not contradict the statements of *Agora* 3244 (which, as we must admit, are by no means complete and not clear throughout). The god (?) Skiros of F III, near to whose sanctuary Theseus put up the heroa for the Salaminian sailors, can also be fitted in, but the fragment does not mention Skiras, and we do not know by whom, or when, according to

Ph. the Oskophoria and the cult of Skiras were founded. Further, it gives no date for the foundation of the sanctuary of Skiros at Phaleron: those who assume that it had existed for long (*i.e.* from the times of Erechtheus) when Theseus built the altars for Phaiax and Nausithoos 5  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma \tau\acute{\omega}\iota \iota\epsilon\rho\acute{\omega}\iota$  cannot be refuted. But I do not see how Ph. can have connected the lord of the Phalerean sanctuary with the prophet Skiros, or how he could bring the latter into relation to the goddess. This is not surprising, but it is important for principles of method: it may not be superfluous to emphasize just here <sup>110</sup>) that we have no right to reject 10 even the smallest fact of cult which is attested by a reputable authority. On the other hand, we see again and again not only how scanty our knowledge is even of Attic festivals <sup>111</sup>), but also how little even the best of ancient scholars discern the cultic facts. The methods of ancient religious science are on the whole so different from ours <sup>112</sup>) that even 15 new authentic testimonies for a cult by no means always enlighten us about the lines of thought in ancient authors, about which we are anyhow most insufficiently informed <sup>113</sup>).

The discussion of Athena Skiras in F 14 has already brought us to the Oskophoria, which was also treated in the second book of Ph.s 20 *Atthis* (F 16;  $\bar{\beta}$  is a certain correction of Boeckh). What he and other Atthidographers had to say about this festival has been lost through the abbreviations made by the excerptor, and we can restore it hypothetically only if at all. Because of the course taken by modern research it is desirable not to begin with Ph. but with the whole of the tradition, 25 and subsequently return the former <sup>114</sup>). I state beforehand that *Agora* 3244 has quickly refuted the attempt made by Deubner at proving the Oskophoria to be a festival of Dionysos <sup>115</sup>). In this inscription we find oskophoroi and deipnophoroi as being appointed by the Salaminioi <sup>116</sup>) evidently for celebrations in the cult of their chief goddess Athena 30 Skiras. The clan definitely has no cult of, or sacrifices to, Dionysos, and that is all the more conclusive as Theseus was accepted into the cult of the clan <sup>117</sup>). The attempt at taking the Oskophoria away from Athena ought not to have been made even because of the literary tradition, if one duly distinguishes in it (as we must do always and everywhere) 35 the tradition of cultic facts from the aitiological narratives. As regards the former: the Oskophoria has its name from the  $\acute{\omega}\sigma\chi\omicron\iota$  or  $\acute{\omega}\sigma\chi\alpha\iota$  <sup>118</sup>) ('vine shoots loaded with grapes' <sup>119</sup>) which are carried by two oskophoroi <sup>120</sup>), young men with certain qualifications <sup>121</sup>), dressed as women

—this at least is the conception of our authorities, who give the aition for this disguise <sup>122</sup>). The two oschophoroi are followed by a chorus, who sings the 'oschophoric songs' <sup>123</sup>). Another group which had a share in the procession or in the ceremonies connected with it (among the latter <sup>5</sup> a *θυσία* is mentioned) is that of the deipnophoroi <sup>124</sup>). The scene of all these celebrations, so far as we can locate them, is Phaleron <sup>125</sup>): the *ὄσχοι* are carried *εἰς τὸ τῆς Σκιράδος Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερόν*, and the Oschophorion is described as *τόπος Ἀθήνησιν Φαληροῦ, ἐνθα τὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερόν*. Accordingly the more succinct versions of heortological tradition, which we <sup>10</sup> have before us in the lexicographers, occasionally describe the Oschophoria simply as *Σκιράδος Ἀθηνᾶς ἑορτή* <sup>126</sup>), and this tradition in itself contains nothing contradicting the short technical description. Matters are different in regard to aitiology: it is unvarying (not a frequent case) in so far as it connects the festival with the return of Theseus from <sup>15</sup> Crete <sup>127</sup>); it is, however, not certain that it unanimously regarded Theseus as the founder: there seems to have been another conception which explained only certain features of it by special circumstances connected with the return, and we shall be able to make it appear probable that this was the conception of Ph. <sup>128</sup>). Further, it is an evident variant that <sup>20</sup> according to the source of Proklos Theseus celebrates *χαριστήρια ἀποδιδούς Ἀθηνᾶι καὶ Διονύσῳ*, whereas according to Demon the Athenians *Διονύσῳ καὶ Ἀριάδῃ χαρίζομενοι διὰ τὸν μῦθον, ἢ μᾶλλον ὅτι συγκομιζομένης ὀπίρας ἐπανήλθον* <sup>129</sup>). I shall for the present leave out of the discussion this second variant occurring in the account of Demon <sup>130</sup>) and <sup>25</sup> shall make only a trivial, but necessary statement: neither the contradiction between the heortological and the aitiological tradition, nor the existence of variants in the latter, is in any way surprising; the cult, simply described by the heortologists, is fixed <sup>131</sup>), its explanations are perpetually more or less in flux. It ought to be unnecessary to state (but <sup>30</sup> unfortunately it is not) that for the religious interpretation of the festival only the cultic facts count, never the aitiological speculations. Those who on the strength of the latter make the Oschophoria a festival of Dionysos commit a fundamental mistake which bears its punishment in itself. The speculations may be interesting in other respects, they may <sup>35</sup> even be historically important, and in this case as in regard to the Skira they are. It has been perceived long ago that Theseus is an intruder in the Oschophoria too <sup>132</sup>), and it must be added that the aitiology which introduced him (quite naturally but in an almost exemplary manner) moved further and further away from the facts of cult in the direction

of the 'myth' of the Cretan adventure. Unfortunately we cannot establish when the version arose which made Theseus return on the day of the Oschophoria, thus explaining some peculiar traits of the festival <sup>133</sup>), but it is evident that the Athena of the account of Proklos, at whose side  
5 was placed the Dionysos of the Cretan myth, is the Athena of the Oschophoria <sup>134</sup>). It is equally evident that Demon, when introducing the couple Dionysos-Ariadne, cut the thread which connected the aition with the real cult: Athena is altogether lacking in his report, and obviously we must not blame the excerptor (Plutarch) for the complete  
10 vagueness as to topography (and up to a point as to the cult) of his otherwise very full description of the procession at the Oschophoria <sup>135</sup>). If Demon proceeded similarly in other cases (and this would agree with the picture we can form of him from the few fragments) we can understand that Ph. criticised him throughout his own *Atthis*. The case is  
15 particularly interesting because, owing to *Agora* 3244, we can see quite distinctly how the connexion of Theseus with the Oschophoria came about <sup>136</sup>): when the clan of the Salaminioi settled at Phaleron not only the connexion of Theseus with the expedition to Crete (one of the oldest parts of his myth) was established, but also (and this is more important  
20 here) the conception that his ship started from Phaleron (the only harbour of Athens in early times) and returned to Phaleron. It was this tradition which the Salaminioi found in existence; it was this which they took into account when admitting on the sixth Pyanepsion a sacrifice for Theseus into the cult of their clan <sup>137</sup>). We must not take this as an  
25 expression of reverence for the 'hero of democracy', an idea which perhaps did not yet exist when they immigrated into Attica and made their Σκιράς an Ἀθηναῖ Σκιράς as a symbol of their new loyalty; it hardly was an act of homage to Athens. What induced the Salaminioi to admit Theseus into their cult was their clan-policy: I do not doubt that it is  
30 here we find the explanation both for the introduction of the Salaminian Skiros into the story of Theseus' expedition to Crete, by which the new Attic *genos* secured for itself an honourable place in the primeval history of Athens <sup>138</sup>), and, on the other hand, for the annexation of the Salaminian thanksgiving festival, the Oschophoria (which the clan brought  
35 with it into its new home) by the narrators of the story of Theseus. The annexation was facilitated (or made possible) by the fact that the Salaminian festival of ripe grapes fell in the same season at which Athens placed the return of Theseus.

There remains to be answered the question as to how Ph., who 'among

others told of the oschophoroi' (F 16), dealt with the Oschophoria; that is we have to ask what aition he gave for the festival and what date for the institution of it. The case is more difficult than that of the Skira, because Harpokration cut away everything apart from the name of the 5 author. Moreover, here we have not the supplementary information which we had from Pausanias for the Skira: in that case we could easily combine Pausanias' account about the Eleusinian Skiros with the remains preserved in Harpokration of the Philochorean tradition. Istros does not give us that help: what Harpokration excerpts from him is the accepted 10 opinion about the institution of the Oschophoria by Theseus and the cultic procession which must have been essentially the same in all accounts. Also Harpokration does not cite Istros so much on account of cultic facts as because he found 'in some writers' the ὄσχη called ὄρεσχάς<sup>139</sup>). As these ἔνιοι are not exactly determined we cannot do anything with 15 them. On the other hand, it seems that the question can easily be answered by a reference to F 183: if according to Ph. the deipnophoroi, who are always mentioned in connexion with the Oschophoria, were instituted as a token of gratitude for the rescue of the victims of the Minotaur, we might infer from this that Ph. agreed with the general 20 opinion. Let us add Plutarch, who dealt with the Oschophoria in two passages of his *Life* of Theseus<sup>140</sup>): the first passage belongs to the framework of the *Life*, the second is an appendix including Demon's description of the procession. The appendix expressly mentions Theseus as the founder; the main account seems to assume the same (at least at first sight), 25 and since Plutarch does not give any variants (as he does for the immediately following description of the Pyanepsia and Eiresione<sup>141</sup>): καίτοι ταῦτά τινες ἐπὶ τοῖς 'Ηρακλείδαις γενέσθαι λέγουσιν) one would think that there were no variants for the Oschophoria. Still I have doubts not only because it is surprising that the founder Theseus is not mentioned 30 until the appendix<sup>142</sup>). According to Demon the procession at the Oschophoria was in honour of Dionysos and Ariadne<sup>143</sup>); the first account, which gives the locality (lacking in the account of Demon), is remarkably vague as to the gods for whom the festival is arranged: Theseus καταπλεύσας ἔθουε ἄς ἐκπλέων θυσίας εὕξατο τοῖς θεοῖς Φαληροῦ.

35 What gods are meant? Certainly not Dionysos and Ariadne, to whom he cannot have made vows when he started on his expedition. 'Ἐκπλέων points back to the account of his departure<sup>144</sup>): on that occasion we hear about the support given to him by the Salaminian king Skiros, about the heroizing in the sanctuary of Skiros at Phaleron of the sailors

lent to him by that king, and about the (thanksgiving) festival of the Kybernesia. We hear, moreover, about a Delphic oracle ordering Theseus to put his expedition under the protection of Aphrodite, and as consequences in cult about Aphrodite Epitragia, and about a procession of 5 girls who walk to the Delphinion carrying a branch of the sacred olive tree <sup>146</sup>), a procession taking place 'still now' on the day of the departure, the sixth Munychion. Neither Apollo nor Aphrodite has any connexion with the Oschophoria <sup>146</sup>); still the first report of Plutarch leads up to that festival. We cannot fail to perceive the vagueness, and (in my <sup>10</sup> opinion) we equally cannot fail to perceive that it is a consequence not of clumsiness on the part of Plutarch <sup>147</sup>), but of a deliberate attempt at harmonizing. It is evident that Plutarch tries to reconcile two different theories about the consequences in cult of the expedition to Crete: the Oschophoria occur in both theories, which we can clearly distinguish <sup>15</sup> in our tradition: (1) one theory moves the Oschophoria into the foreground explaining it as the thanksgiving festival proper for the happy return; the festival is celebrated *ἐνεκα τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας* <sup>148</sup>). This version is relatively early and very firmly established <sup>149</sup>) although it is purely aitiological and actually without a support in cult, for the <sup>20</sup> Oschophoria is celebrated in honour of Athena Skiras, and neither she nor Athena generally is connected to any considerable degree with Theseus and the expedition to Crete <sup>150</sup>); the connexion even is so loose that Demon could give the aitiology a form that in fact brought it into contrast with the cult <sup>151</sup>). (2) The second theory is complete in itself <sup>25</sup> and abounds in cultic relations of the most varied kind, all referring to conditions and events of the expedition to Crete. This version opens with cultic facts recalling the departure, *viz.* the cult of Aphrodite Epitragia and the procession to Apollo Delphinios, and it ends with the cults of the heroes at Phaleron, the institution of the Kybernesia, the thank- <sup>30</sup> giving sacrifices offered by Theseus at Phaleron to the gods who had assisted him, and the thanksgiving festivals in honour of Apollo (Pyaneipsia and Eiresione), the two last also having been vowed before his departure. The Oschophoria are brought into this context merely by the fact that certain peculiar traits (*viz.* the garlanding not of the herald <sup>35</sup> but of the kerykeion, and the double cry *ἐλελεῦ τοῦ τοῦ* at the sacrifice) are explained by the particular conditions in Athens on the day of the return <sup>152</sup>). The inference is obvious: in this version the Oschophoria are an existing festival, and Theseus, who had started on the sixth of Munychion, accidentally returns to Athens after an absence of exactly

six months on the day of the Oschophoria <sup>158</sup>). All Plutarch does is not to stress this point. Now in the section of the *Life* Plut. 17/8; 22 the part concerned with Phaleron (17, 6/7) is expressly attested for Ph. <sup>154</sup>); everything therefore tells in favour of assigning to him the corresponding 5 part (ch. 22, 1-4) as well <sup>155</sup>). True, there is one difficulty: the institution of the Kybernesia (F 111), if it is a thanksgiving festival for the whole expedition, would not agree very well with the thanksgiving festival inferred for him from F 183 <sup>156</sup>). The difficulty is not very serious: firstly the Kybernesia is only for the two navigators from Salamis, and secondly 10 the provenance of F 183 is unknown, but nothing tells against the idea of deriving it from the earlier special work *Περὶ ἐορτῶν* <sup>157</sup>). If this idea is correct Ph. would have changed his view about the Oschophoria between the composing of that book and the *Atthis*. That is not impossible in itself, and it is doubly comprehensible if he wished to contradict Demon's 15 peculiar shaping of the accepted opinion. But the pleasure of criticism hardly furnishes a sufficient reason. What determined Ph. to change his interpretation (if he has changed it) we learn from F 17: it was his new judgement on Minos because of which he largely eliminated Ariadne from the story of the expedition to Crete <sup>158</sup>). The theory of the Oscho- 20 phoria developed on that basis has great advantages in our view as compared with the accepted theory: it signifies a new realization of the nature of the festival, which belongs to Skiras—an agrarian goddess whom one had never been able to bring into true connexion with the requirements of the expedition to Crete. This realization was most 25 comprehensive and most fertile in regard to history of religion if we may assign to Ph. the variant (I have little doubt that we may) which is very surprising in the account of Demon: the custom of offering ὄσχοι is the expression of gratitude to Dionysos and Ariadne διὰ τὸν μῦθον ἢ μᾶλλον 30 δτι συγκομιζομένης ὀπώρας ἐπανῆλθον <sup>159</sup>). Another advantage: although Ph. acknowledged the Oschophoria as a festival of the vintage, thus returning it to the goddess to whom it belonged originally, he was not obliged to dispute the claims of the Salaminioi to a place of honour in Attic history, for there remained in the Theseus story the cult-fellow of the goddess, the Salaminian-Phalerian Skiros, who had become free 35 for aitiological speculation when Skiras became Athena Skiras <sup>160</sup>). It is exemplary, particularly when we compare the arbitrary proceeding of Demon, how Ph. hit the right mean between the facts of cult and the claims of pseudo-history, which was history for him. I believe all these considerations to be quite certain, and I therefore regret that I must

conclude with a question which the means at our disposal do not allow us to answer: according to Ph. the Oschophoria existed before Theseus, and so most probably did the cult of Skiros at Phaleron. But we do not know how he dated either absolutely. It would be wrong to infer the time of Erechtheus from F 14, for the Skiros of F 14 is not the Skiros of the Theseus story of F 111; he is from Dodona, not from Salamis, and he is a prophet, not a king <sup>161</sup>).

I have hitherto entirely disregarded a further modern dogma in order to leave unobscured the clear and relatively simple tradition about the two festivals of Athena Skiras. The supporters of this theory refer F 15 to the Oschophoria, and find in Athenaios either a grave corruption or a confusion and contamination because they want to eliminate the words τοῖς Σκίροις which they find inconvenient (I do not know why) although the words are an accurate and technical statement occurring in the right place <sup>162</sup>). Let us first, according to our custom, examine the tradition. Aristodemos, a grammarian from a good period, an Alexandrian scholar and a disciple of Aristarchos, with a special interest in Thebes and her great poet, in his book on Pindar mentioned among other matters an Athenian agon <sup>163</sup>). Judging from the manner in which Athenaios attests the word πενταπλόα from Ph.s *Atthis* and from Aristodemos, the ordinary conception of such double quotations is applicable as to the form, and credible as to the matter here as in similar cases <sup>164</sup>): the grammarian referred for the Attic custom to the testimony of the most distinguished Atthidographer. It is therefore highly probable that we have before us in F 15 a description by Ph. of a custom at the Skira <sup>165</sup>). This fact determined my arrangement of the fragments, and it is important because it conclusively confirms the cult of Skiras in Skiron, a cult which, in agreement with the tradition, we assumed as having been handed down by Ph. and therefore as being a fact <sup>166</sup>). But whether the report comes from Ph. or from Aristodemos, it is extant in three versions, viz. in Athenaios, in the Scholia on Nicander, and in Proklos' *Chrestomathy* <sup>167</sup>). All three agree in the statements that the agon was a race, that it was run from the sanctuary of Dionysos to that of Skiras, and that the runners carried the so-called ὠσχος <sup>168</sup>). The attestation of the further particulars is no longer complete: the runners are simply called ἐφηβοί in Athenaios and in Proklos, παῖδες ἀμφιθαλεῖς in the Scholion <sup>169</sup>); according to the Scholion and to Proklos they were taken from the phylai, and must therefore probably be regarded as the representatives of these <sup>170</sup>). The winner drinks from the Pentaploa,



the composition of which is described accurately in Athenaios and Proklos, and he *κωμάζει μετὰ χοροῦ* (*i.e.* he probably returns to the city in the komos) according to Athenaios, who alone has preserved the name of the festival, τοῖς Σκίροις<sup>171</sup>). This enumeration sufficiently proves that we are dealing with three independent excerpts from the same source, *viz.* Aristodemos' book about Pindar; there are no divergences as to the matter in the three excerpts, and the slight differences can easily be explained by the nature and the purposes of the excerpts. Athenaios, who alone gives his authorities, and whose citations usually are reliable, renders a part of Aristodemos' description in indirect speech, but he evidently closely follows the arrangement of the grammarian, though it is possible that he omitted one whole section<sup>172</sup>). The Scholiast on Nicander and Proklos cut their source down in widely different ways. The Scholiast, who is interested only in the meaning of the word ὄσχος<sup>173</sup>), simply omitted the second part dealing with the victor; in Proklos (to state at once what is evident) Aristodemos' account of the race at the Skira is torn into two pieces, and inserted into a description of the procession at the Oskophoria<sup>174</sup>); this description differs from that of Demon in one detail only<sup>175</sup>) and may therefore represent the tradition handed down by Attidography generally. The individual abbreviations and omissions in this version of Aristodemos' account, which are partly due to the insertion into another context, are of no great importance; the main point is the obviousness of the contamination of the two accounts, which all other sources give separately. The assumption of modern writers that Proklos assigned both the race and the procession to the Oskophoria, an assumption they found so self-evident that they did not indicate it expressly, is absolutely lacking in foundation. Proklos, in fact, is not speaking of festivals but of Ὀσχοφορικὰ μέλη. Whether he fused into one the race and the procession, or whether he regarded them as two events of the same festival, or whether he believed that Oskophoric songs were sung at all festivals in which oskophoroi played a part—in any case, in his account the precise statements of the other sources referring to these points are lacking, *viz.* the ἐν Σκίροις of Aristodemos, and the τῶν Ὀσχοφορίων ἑορτή of Demon; he replaced these by a vague μέλη παρ' Ἀθηναίους ἤιδετο and ἦν τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ἡ παραπομπή<sup>176</sup>). Thus the whole discussion from A. Mommsen and Robert down to Gjerstad and Deubner about the relations to each other of the two celebrations is fruitless: it is based on prejudices concerning the matter, on arbitrary or wrong interpretations of the individual pieces

of evidence, and on a lack of insight into the nature and the value of the tradition <sup>177</sup>). Of the alternative conclusions reached on this basis, viz. a grave corruption in the text of Athenaios or a confusion of the Skirophoria with the Oschophoria made by Aristodemos or by Athenaios <sup>178</sup>), the second is altogether incapable of discussion: for Athenaios the assumption of a confusion of the festivals lacks sense, because he simply excerpted from Aristodemos' book on Pindar, and for Aristodemos this confusion is highly improbable as his clear and well-arranged account of the agon begins with the qualification ἐν Σκίροις; for Aristodemos' authority Ph. the idea is simply impossible. Our tradition is perfectly clear: the procession is attested for the Oschophoria, the race for the Skirophoria; the first by the *Atthis*, so far as we know it, the second by (Ph.-)Aristodemos in Athenaios. In view of these authorities the only matter that might be discussed is the assumption of a corruption; and for this a simple assertion is not sufficient. Anybody asserting that ἐν Σκίροις is corrupt must prove either that a race of epheboi is impossible for the Skira, or that the two celebrations described in our sources so closely resemble each other that they actually must be one and the same. I do not see how the first point can be proved after it has been shown that the tradition of the cult of Athena Skiras at Skiron is a fact, and that the tracing back of the information about it 'merely to the authority of Suetonius and a late, ill-informed grammarian' is wrong <sup>179</sup>): the history of the Skirophoria makes it appear natural that the programme was copious, and surely nobody will venture to assert that our knowledge of it is complete. Any attempt to prove the second point would be doomed to failure from the start: a race is not a procession, and attempts at reconciliation such as the suggestion 'that the two victors in the race became the leaders of the procession' <sup>180</sup>), condemn themselves; there is but one victor in a race: ὁ νικήσας says Aristodemos; ὁ πρότερος Proklos <sup>181</sup>). And these are not the only difficulties; the two celebrations differ in almost all details <sup>182</sup>).

The examination of the tradition, which is our primary task, has brought us so far <sup>183</sup>). We have presented it fully, and tried to interpret it without concealing the difficulties, but also without pre-conceived opinions; i.e. without finding confusion everywhere at first sight and in particular without treating *de haut en bas* the ancient reporters to whom alone we owe the cultic facts with which we must work, and of whom we must assume (until the contrary is proved) that they knew the facts as well as the theological and aitiological speculations attached to the

facts. The result of this treatment (to sum it up succinctly) is this: the facts preserved by the ancient authorities allow us to form a picture of the Skira and the Oskophoria which, though by no means complete, is clearer than the picture we can form of most Attic festivals. The tradition is, anyway, so rich, and the light thrown on it by *Agora 3244* is so strong that even the historical combinations based on the tradition reach a high degree of probability. In these combinations we are not bound, of course, to the ancient speculations and aitiologies<sup>184</sup>; it is only from the cultic facts handed down to us that we must not emancipate ourselves in such a degree as modern heortologists have done. Because of their treatment of the tradition, wrong in principle in my opinion, and because of the confusion which they consequently brought about I wish to end up with two succinct remarks referring more to the matter than to history of tradition:

(1) Since the race of the Skira leads to the sanctuary of Athena Skiras it belongs to the cult of the same goddess who was worshipped at Phaleron by the clan of the Salaminioi. When in both ceremonies the oskophoroi play a part we must infer that the goddess of vegetation was also regarded as the protectress of viticulture<sup>185</sup>). That looks as old as the pentaploa as the prize for the winner in the race and the ceremony of the race in general. If anything has been added subsequently it is the god of wine Dionysos whose sanctuary is the starting-point for the race<sup>186</sup>). An intrusion like that, perhaps at a relatively early time, is not surprising, least of all in connexion with a festival which is in honour of the Eleusinian goddesses as well as of Skiras, and which is moreover characterized by the participation of deities belonging to the city of Athens—a festival, in short, that has had a history. But that intrusion of Dionysos corroborates the belonging of the race to the Skira or, to put it more cautiously, it should be a warning from the point of view of cultic facts against transferring the race to the Oskophoria, for *Agora 3244* has taught us that as late as 363/2 B.C. Dionysos had no place in the cult of the Salaminioi. Those who range the race among the customs of the Oskophoria must assume that it was introduced between 363/2 B.C. and the time when Ph. wrote the second book of his *Atthis*, perhaps as one of the many innovations of the religious policy of Lykurgos. Speculations about the question 'warum die traubenweihe nicht in Athen selbst stattfand, warum man ans meer zog' (which, in fact, one did not) miss the mark<sup>187</sup>). If (it is an if) Dionysos had a share also in the Oskophoria, it is not 'the special god of wine, the Dionysos of the Anthesteria, who,

in fact, came to Attica over the sea' <sup>188</sup>) but the Dionysos of the Ariadne story. In that case aitiology has influenced the cult; Lykurgos (or whoever it was) developed the festival of the Oschophoria more richly, following the narratives of the *Atthides*. All this certainly is not impossible, but there is no sound reason for such speculations, as tradition attests Athena Skiras at Skiron and assigns the race of the epheboi to the festival of the Skira belonging to Athena Skiras.

(2) This conviction is based on such sound evidence that it cannot be shattered even if an agon of some kind took place at the Oschophoria too, for we cannot pretend to know the whole programme of this festival any more than that of the Skira; rather, we know even less because the tradition for the Skira is more abundant. As a matter of fact *Agora* 3244 includes regulations for a *ἄμιλλος* <sup>189</sup>). Considering the nature of the document <sup>190</sup>) it is by no means astonishing that we are given no details about this *ἄμιλλος*; it is not even certain that it belongs to the chief festival of Athena Skiras, *i.e.* to the Oschophoria (which is also not mentioned in the inscription) <sup>191</sup>). Only one thing is certain: like the oschophoroi and the deipnophoroi the *ἄμιλλος* belongs to the gentilitial cult of the Salaminioi, and the participants are members of the *genos* <sup>192</sup>). According to the statements just made it is impossible that it is in any way connected with Dionysos, because the agon had been in existence (evidently for a long time) in 363/2 B.C.; it is therefore impossible to equate it with the *ἄγων τῶν ἐφήβων δρόμοι*, which was run *ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ Διονύσου μέχρι τοῦ τῆς Σκιράδος Ἰαθηνᾶς ἱεροῦ*, and I will give an impressive warning against finding in this *ἄμιλλος* a support for the supposition that the race of the epheboi took place not at the Skira but at the Oschophoria. On the contrary, the fact that a race of young men from the ten phylai carrying branches of vine took place at the Skira in honour of Athena Skiras seems to support the inference made likely by *Agora* 3244 that the *ἄμιλλος* of the Salaminioi belongs to their Athena festival. If this inference is correct it means another point of resemblance between the cult of Skiras at the Skiron and that at Phaleron. Of resemblance, not of identity, be it well noted. The Salaminian Skiras became Athena Skiras in Attica, and this change had the immediate consequence that her male partner Skiros receded in the cult degenerating, as one might say, into a hero, and thus becoming free for aitiological speculation <sup>193</sup>). The cult of Skiras herself developed differently according to the different conditions at the two places where it appeared in Attica. The chief difference is that at Phaleron (so far as we can see), it remained a pure cult of Athena Skiras and almost

purely a cult of the *genos*, whereas at Skiron the cult entered into a connexion first with the goddesses of Eleusis, later with the deities of the Akropolis<sup>194</sup>). Therefore the Oschophoria is a simple festival, the Skira a complicated one. Any inferences back to the ancient cult of Salamis must be made, if they are to have any certainty, particularly (if not only) from the cult at Phaleron.

(17-19) About Theseus in Ph. we know relatively much, though mostly isolated facts. For the fundamental source of Plutarch's biography of Theseus is not Ph. but a later general tradition, with variants and learned quotations, perhaps Istros' *Συναγωγή τῶν Ἀθίδων*. We must leave open the question whether at least Ph. has been read by Plutarch in the original; about the possibility of reconstructing his narrative from Plutarch with some degree of certainty see on the individual fragments.

(17) In the account of the Cretan expedition and the Minotaur<sup>1</sup>) Plutarch quotes Ph. three times<sup>2</sup>), and the passages quoted which may have occurred in the *Atthis* in the same sequence show with sufficient clearness the fundamental lines and the character of his narrative. The loss of particulars<sup>3</sup>) is most annoying in regard to heortology: we merely learn about the establishment of the Kybernesia (F 111), and this speciality was hardly all Ph. knew about Athenian commemorations of the expedition to Crete. But we are left with the negative and reduced to conjectures at the best. Plutarch, of course, preferred those sources which carried back as many and as important institutions as possible to Theseus, and chs. 22/3, in which he deals with Theseus' return, are neither complete nor really well arranged. We must therefore not draw conclusions *e silentio* from the absence of quotations from Ph. in this section. On the other hand F 15/16 have shown that Ph. disputed the claim of Theseus at least to the Oschophoria, probably expressly criticizing Demon. We should like to make Ph. conclude his account with the establishment of the Theseus cult, *viz.* to ascribe to him the note ch. 23, 5, too brief unfortunately, but certainly not a part from the quotation from Demon (327 F 6). This note seems to refer to two cults, the State cult in the Theseion and that in which the Phyalids officiated in the deme Lakiadai. F 18 and the consideration of the Attic gentilitian and deme cults, also elsewhere to be perceived in the Theseus story, would recommend the attribution to Ph., and we might even join to this note as belonging to Ph. that other in ch. 23, chronologically appropriate, about the ship of Theseus which ἄχρι τῶν Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως χρόνων διεφύλαττον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι. In view of the removal of the Oschophoria after Theseus'

return one is further inclined to assign to Ph. the record in ch. 18 of matters of cult connected with the preparations for the expedition—the procession of the virgins with a *ἱκετήρια*, the Delphic oracle, and the cult of Aphrodite Epitragia <sup>4</sup>). F 111 shows that Ph. developed these preparations with regard to cultic facts still existing at his own time, and perhaps this also is a difference between his record and the bold combinations of Demon. The discussion on the character of Minos with the criticism of the tragic poets, not at all impossible for Ph., agrees with the behaviour of the Cretan king as described in F 17; the quotation from Aristotle (interesting in itself but obviously inserted later) almost seems to interrupt a context of Ph. Ch. 16, 1 shows that Ph. assumed the killing of Androgeos <sup>5</sup>) as being the reason for the despatch of the children, and that he made Theseus accompany them on the third occasion of their being sent in opposition to Hellanikos and probably the entire early tradition of the myth which assumed one sending of hostages only <sup>6</sup>). The fact that Plutarch (ch. 17, 3) cites the earlier account as a variant of Hellanikos would agree with this suggestion. Again one is inclined to assign to Ph. the main narrative ch. 17, 1-2, for the *διαβολαί* against Aigeus are well in accord with the attack of Menestheus on king Theseus in ch. 32, 1 <sup>7</sup>).

The rationalisation of the *τραγικώτατος μῦθος*, illustrated by Euripidean verses, is earlier than Ph., but possibly not very much <sup>8</sup>). The transposition of Palaiphatos (*Apist.* 2) still keeps quite closely to the myth: Tauros, a *νεανίας κάλλι διαφέρων* at the court of Minos, was introduced because the nameless bastard of Pasiphae must have a father. It may be an after-effect of that version when in Ph. the strategos of Minos *διαβολὴν εἶχεν ὡς τῆι Πασιφάηι πλησιάζων*. Otherwise Ph., as Demon before him, only knows the strategos, and before Palaiphatos it was possible for Kleidemos (323 F 17) entirely to remove the figure. The agreement of Ph. and Demon is confined to the single point of Tauros being strategos, whom Demon also shows in action; but Ph. could not make use of that naval battle. Perhaps the most interesting point of F 17 is the fact of his quoting, against tragedy (and surely also against Demon), 'the Cretans' (a) or 'the Cnossians' (b). This evidently means literary *Κρητικά* <sup>9</sup>) which furnished him with the favourable conception of Minos. He added to it the motif of the agon, and as it is a wrestling-match (*τοῦ Ταύρου καταπαλαισθέντος*) one is reminded of the fact that Theseus was regarded as a famous wrestler or even as the inventor of this form of sport <sup>10</sup>). Thus in his record everything happens more humanely and

more peacefully than even in Kleidemos, who in his most peculiar story simply ignored not only Tauros but apparently the love-affair of Theseus with Ariadne (or at least its disastrous consequences) as well, replacing it by the treaty of friendship between Athens and Crete concluded by Theseus and queen Ariadne. Perhaps the peculiar report of Kleidemos also supplies the explanation of the greatest difficulty in F 17—the question of what became of Ariadne in Ph. He speaks of her admiration of Theseus, and that trait cannot be unimportant, because of his express reference to a Cretan custom (θεᾶσθαι καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας) which is obviously mentioned only in order to have a reason for bringing Ariadne in at all. But he seems to have left it at that, for the concluding words of the fragment make a marriage and even more an abduction impossible. She could not be left out of the story altogether by an author who was too historically-minded to accept the arbitrary transformation of Kleidemos; but in Ph.'s account, too, there is no question of a wrong committed by Theseus; the slurs cast upon him by the Megarians and their inventions as to Peisistratos' handling of Hesiod's text <sup>21</sup>) became automatically untenable, if he neither married nor abducted Ariadne <sup>22</sup>). τὸν ἀγῶνα κτλ.] the Philochorean version is followed (without a quotation and with many errors) by Johann. Antioch. IV 538, I § 16 Mü. The explanation of the name Tauros διὰ τὸ θυμοειδὲς καὶ τοῦ τρόπου τὸ ἄγριον either is a misinterpretation of καὶ γὰρ ἡ δύναμις αὐτοῦ κτλ. or an autoschediasm.

(18) Plutarch attests with absolute certainty the authorship of Ph. in regard to the transfer of the Theseus sanctuaries to Herakles. It is the answer to the ζήτημα why the Attic national hero (as such he is acknowledged by the State in 475 B.C. at the latest) receives so little recognition in cult, whereas the 'Dorian' Herakles receives so much. Already in Euripides' *Herakles* the transfer is the expression of Theseus' gratitude for being released from the underworld by Herakles <sup>1</sup>). In this play he comes to the help of Amphitryon τίνων ἀμοιβὰς ὧν ὑπῆρξεν 'Ηρακλῆς / σώσας με νέρθεν (1169/70; cf. 619), and he then invites Herakles to follow him to Athens (1324 ff.): ἐκεῖ χέρας σὰς ἀγρίσας μιάσματος / δόμους τε δώσω χρημάτων τ' ἐμῶν μέρος. / ἀ δ' ἐκ πολιτῶν δῶρ' ἔχω σώσας κόρους / δις ἑπτὰ, ταῦρον Κνώσιον κατακτανῶν, / σοὶ ταῦτα δώσω· πανταχοῦ δέ μοι χθονὸς / τεμένη δέδασται· ταῦτ' ἐπωνομασμένα / σέθεν τὸ λοιπὸν ἐκ βροτῶν κεκλήσεται / ζῶντος· θανόντα δ', εὖτ' ἂν εἰς Ἄιδου μὸλῃς, / θυσίαισι λαίνοισι τ' ἐξογκώμασιν / τίμιον ἀνάξει πᾶσ' Ἀθηναίων πόλις / . . . κάγῳ χάριν σοὶ τῆς ἐμῆς σωτηρίας / τήνδ' ἀντιδώσω. I leave open the question whether the assertion that the Attic sanctuaries of Herakles originally were Theseia, was 'common belief'

or even 'the official explanation' <sup>3</sup>), or whether it is an invention of Euripides, who introduced Theseus into this context <sup>3</sup>). Probability favours the latter alternative, because Euripides speaks of all Theseia, whereas Ph. excepts four, thus correcting the tragic poet <sup>4</sup>). We may accordingly claim for Ph. the connexion of the events as related in Plutarch, a fact of far-reaching consequence for reconstructing his Theseus story.

In view of the nature of the two sources (Plutarch; Christian writers) the reconstruction is not quite easy. In the last section of his *Theseus*, after a somewhat clumsy introduction <sup>5</sup>) περί γάμων Θησέως and about his relations to other heroes (participation in the τότε τοῖς ἀρίστοις ἄθλοι γινόμενοι), Plutarch first records (it is in fact part of the introduction) how Theseus and Peirithoos on the one side and Theseus and Herakles on the other came to be friends (ch. 30); he then narrates the two mythic adventures in which these friendships play a part, viz. the rape of Helen (ch. 31, 1-3) and the attempted rape of Kore (ch. 31, 4-5) which find a common ending in the release of Theseus by Herakles (ch. 35, 1-2 = F 18). The 'historical' report about the events in Athens (sedition of Menestheus and change of dynasty) is worked into this narrative in two sections: (1) during the absence of Theseus (chs. 32-34) <sup>6</sup>); (2) after his return (ch. 35) <sup>7</sup>). It was not Plutarch who created the resulting narrative, nor certainly Ph.; Plutarch made the general tradition the foundation of his account in this instance too. This is proved by the quotations which cannot be referred to Ph.: (1) Herodoros and an anonymous collective quotation as far as Herakles is concerned (ch. 29, 3; 30, 4-5); (2) Hellanikos at the opening of the story about Helen (ch. 31, 1); (3) Dikaiarchos and the Megarian Hereas for the campaign of revenge of the Tyndarids (ch. 32, 5-7); (4) Homer, Anonymoi, Istros (who wrote later than Ph.), all in the same passage for the questions concerning Aithra (ch. 34). Ph. himself is cited twice for particulars (ch. 29, 4 in the introductory part = F 112; ch. 35, 3 = F 18), and possibly we can refer a third note back to him (ch. 35, 4; see on F 19). The wording of F 19 makes it appear more than probable that the 'historical' report about the change of government also occurred in his *Atthis*; for the Helen story the Megarian quotation <sup>8</sup>) and for the Peirithoos story (which Plutarch relates without quoting any authority) F 18 and the comparison with Euripides may serve the same purpose. We cannot, however, simply admit into a collection of fragments the details of any of these reports in Plutarch; but the rationalization of Theseus' descent to the underworld <sup>9</sup>) seems now to be certain.



πλήν τεσσάρων] Of course, we must believe Ph. as to the number; he surely enumerated the precincts. He does not say that they were all situated within the city (as Judeich *Topogr.*<sup>2</sup> p. 456 assumes), but they may have been <sup>10</sup>). They probably were the following: (1) the spacious 5 precinct near the Agora <sup>11</sup>) where in 475 B.C. the remains of the hero brought home by Kimon were laid to rest. The *Atthides* seem uniformly to have assigned the foundation of this sanctuary to the time of Theseus himself: it was conceived to be the expression of gratitude of the town for the rescue of the hostages <sup>12</sup>). Even if Aristotle's evidence ('*Αθπ.* 15, 4) <sup>10</sup> for its existence at the time of the Pisistratids drops out it may be inferred from the general agreement that it was older than the sixth century B.C. (2) The Theseion in the Peiraeus <sup>13</sup>). (3) A sanctuary in the western suburban district <sup>14</sup>). (4) A ἡρώιον Πειρίθου καὶ Θησέως at Kolonos Hippios (Pausan. 1, 30, 4), attested and accurately localized already by <sup>15</sup> Sophokles *O.C.* 1590/4 at the spot where the *καταρράκτης ὁδός* <sup>15</sup>) marks the entrance into the underworld and where 'some' made the rape of Kore happen <sup>16</sup>). Why Ph. should 'hardly have counted' precisely this sanctuary <sup>17</sup>), I do not understand. What he probably did not count were cults outside the town like that of the Phytalids in Lakiadai.

<sup>20</sup> (19) Immediately after F 18a Plutarch (*Theseus* 35, 4-5) continues: εὐθύς (αὐθις *Rei*) δὲ βουλόμενος (*scil.* Theseus) ὡς πρότερον ἄρχειν καὶ καθ-  
 ηγεῖσθαι τοῦ πολιτεύματος, εἰς στάσεις ἐπέπεσε καὶ ταραχάς, οὓς μὲν ἀπ-  
 ἔλιπε μισοῦντας αὐτὸν εὗρισκαν τὸ μὴ φοβεῖσθαι τῷ μισεῖν προσειληφότας,  
 ἐν δὲ τῷ δήμῳ πολὺ τὸ διεφθαρμένον ὄρων καὶ θεραπεύεσθαι βουλόμενον  
<sup>25</sup> ἀντὶ τοῦ ποιεῖν σιωπῆν τὸ προστατόμενον (result of the demagogic agitation  
 of Menestheus ch. 32, 1). ἐπιχειρῶν οὖν βιάζεσθαι κατεδημαγωγεῖτο καὶ κατ-  
 εστασιάζετο· καὶ τέλος ἀπογνοὺς τὰ πράγματα τοὺς μὲν παῖδας εἰς Εὐβοίαν  
 ὑπέξεπεμψε πρὸς Ἐλεφήνορα τὸν Χαλκῶδοντος, αὐτὸς δὲ Γαργηττοῖ κατὰ τῶν  
 Ἀθηναίων ἀράς θέμενος, οὗ νῦν ἐστὶ τὸ καλούμενον Ἀρατήριον, εἰς Σκῦρον  
<sup>30</sup> ἐξέπλευσεν, οὐσης αὐτῷ πρὸς τοὺς ἐκεῖ φιλάς, ὡς ὤμετο, καὶ χωρίων ἐν  
 τῇ νήσῳ πατρώϊων. As the Areterion is attested for Ph. and not mentioned  
 elsewhere <sup>1</sup>) it seems obvious to ascribe also this more exact note <sup>2</sup>) to  
 him. But we cannot state anything about the context in which it occurred.  
 Tradition generally agrees in making Theseus, if he does not remain in  
<sup>35</sup> the underworld <sup>3</sup>), return or try to return to Athens, and F 18 is evidence  
 for Ph. having followed that tradition. He must also have assumed that  
 sooner or later a change of dynasty took place, if only because of *Il. B*  
 547/56. Uncertainties begin when we come to the particulars; they concern  
 above all (which is not really a detail) the conception of Theseus' govern-

ment and the opinion about his person and his role in the constitutional history of Athens. The account of the adventure in Epirus (ch. 35, 1-3) may be ascribed to Ph. with some confidence, but it is doubtful whether that is valid for ch. 35, 4-6 about the party-warfare (if we may use that term). Apart from the abundance of variants about facts connected with it—the destination of Theseus' flight from Athens; the manner of his death in Skyros (where ch. 35, 6-7 unfortunately cites anonymously); the fate of his sons *etc.*—, the *Vita* itself is not uniform in its account of the position held by king Theseus: chs. 24/5 show a conception quite different from ch. (32-)35 where, as a king, he demands silent obedience from his subjects. It therefore seems desirable to present the tradition clearly and succinctly even if we do not reach a final decision. The two conceptions—usually connected with the synoecism for the mention of which by Ph. we unfortunately have but the bare fact in F 94—stand in sharp contrast to each other as early as the last third of the fifth century. The contrast is much sharper than that about Solon or Kleisthenes, for concerning them opinions could fluctuate only as to the tendency of their constitution and the degree of democratization. We have first the conception of Thukyd. 2, 15 <sup>4</sup>) which is the natural one in regard to a king of the period before the Trojan War. According to him Theseus is an absolute king who γενόμενος μετὰ τοῦ ξυνετοῦ καὶ δυνατός compulsorily carried through synoecism, and by whom the city μεγάλη γενομένη παρεδόθη τοῖς ἔπειτα. This view may in the fourth century have been superseded by the new conception of the democrat Theseus, but that it is not quite dead and done with even in the *Althides* is shown by Theseus' claim to silent obedience from his subjects (Plutarch. ch. 35, 4) and even more by the agitation of Menestheus (ch. 32, 1) among the aristocracy, the δυνατοί—πάλαι βαρυνόμενους τὸν Θησέα καὶ νομίζοντας ἀρχὴν καὶ βασιλείαν ἀφηρημένον ἐκάστου τῶν κατὰ δῆμον εὐπατρι-

30 δῶν εἰς ἓν ἄστυ συνείρξαντα πάντας ὑπὸ χροῖς χρῆσθαι καὶ δούλοις—and the people—ἄναρ ἐλευθερίας ὀρώντας, ἔργω δ' ἀπεστερημένους πατρίδων καὶ ἱερῶν, ὅπως ἀντὶ πολλῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶν καὶ γνησίων βασιλέων πρὸς ἓνα δεσπότην ἐπηλυν καὶ ξένον ἀποβλέπωσι. This Theseus is the despot of Thukydides; such a δεσπότης ἐπηλυς καὶ ξένος does not voluntarily hand over his

35 power to the demos, least of all in the opinion of an author who knows the difference between δυνατοί (εὐπατρίδαι) and πολλοί; he may, however, be killed, overthrown, or expelled by the representative of a family which by its descent has a better claim to the throne like the Erechthid Menestheus. If we may assume (as seems probable) that Ph. gave his account

in this sense, certainly not belittling Theseus (or Menestheus either, whom Homer had praised?), this incidentally favours the opinion that the idea of Theseus as a democrat is not an early one, whereas the king who achieved the synoecism of Athens and the hero of the *Theseid(s)* may certainly be dated back to the sixth century. The new conception was established (as distinctly as was possible in tragedy) by Euripides *Hik.* 403/8: πρῶτον μὲν ἤρξω τοῦ λόγου ψευδῶς, ξένη, / ζητῶν τύραννον ἐνθάδ'· οὐ γὰρ ἄρχεται / ἐνὸς πρὸς ἀνδρός, ἀλλ' ἐλευθέρα πόλις· / δῆμος δ' ἀνάσσει διαδοχαῖσιν ἐν μέρει / ἐν ἰαυσίαισιν, οὐχὶ τῷ πλούτῳ διδούς / τὸ πλείστον, ἀλλὰ χῶ πένης ἔχων ἴσον. This Theseus is not a king 'mit beschränkter machtvollkommenheit' (as Robert *Heldensage* p. 754 describes him), he is not a king at all, but may be conceived as being the polemarch of the year in which the Seven marched against Thebes <sup>5</sup>), if one does not prefer to see in his description the counterpart of Perikles.

<sup>15</sup> Even if this conception is earlier than Euripides (which I do not believe), the Athens of Theseus as described by the poet was a democracy, and the Euripidean Theseus must therefore have renounced his kingship as the Kodrids did in some historical books <sup>6</sup>). In any case, this is the conception prevailing in the fourth century which also invaded the *Atthides* in different nuances and with different details, as was natural in an invention which contradicted the list of kings created by Hellanikos and regarded as a historical document <sup>7</sup>). Apart from the picture by Euphranor <sup>8</sup>) see Isokr. *Panath.* 129 ἀκμάζων τὴν μὲν πόλιν, ὡς λέγεται <sup>9</sup>), διοικεῖν τῷ πλήθει παρέδωκεν, αὐτὸς δὲ ὑπὲρ ταύτης τε καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων <sup>25</sup> διετέλει κινδυνεύων; [Demosth.] Κατὰ Νεαίρ. 75 ἐπειδὴ δὲ Θησεὺς συνώκισεν αὐτοὺς καὶ δημοκρατίαν ἐποίησε κτλ.; Marm. Pag. 239 A 20 ἀφ' οὗ Θησεὺς βασιλεύσας Ἀθηνῶν τὰς δώδεκα πόλεις εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ συνώκισεν καὶ πολιτείαν καὶ τὴν δημοκρατίαν παρέδωκε; Plutarch *Theseus* 24, 2 where Theseus achieves synoecism τοῖς δυνατοῖς ἀβασίλευτον πολιτείαν προτείμων <sup>30</sup> καὶ δημοκρατίαν αὐτῷ μόνον ἄρχοντι πολέμου καὶ νόμων φύλακι χρησομένην, τῶν δ' ἄλλων παρέξουσιν ἅπασιν ἰσομοίραν. The last passage shows, like the attempt at a compromise made by Isokrates <sup>10</sup>) and the severe criticism of Pausanias, which may well have been taken from the *Atthis* of Ph. <sup>11</sup>), into what difficulties the conception of Euripides was bound to lead anybody <sup>35</sup> who wrote a history of Athens. Aristotle is apparently trying to steer a middle course when he describes the second κατάστασις as πολιτείας τάξις ἢ ἐπὶ Θησεῶς γενομένη μικρὸν παρεγκλίνοῦσα τῆς βασιλικῆς <sup>12</sup>). Theophrastus, being little concerned about history, was less conscientious: since a 'king' of this sort could not very well be expelled by a pretendent

he made the democracy of Theseus complete by the institution of ostracism<sup>13</sup>), and his oligarch is at least satisfied by the fact that Theseus, who has introduced τὸ δημαγωγῶν γένος, is its first victim<sup>14</sup>). The part of the demagogue in a typical story of that kind could of course be played also by the Erechthid Menestheus.

(20) Ph. had repeatedly to discuss the Areopagos, the changing sphere of its functions, and the qualification of its members<sup>1</sup>). In the third book the connexion with the Solonian legislation is obvious. Whether the year of the reform 462/1 B.C. was treated in the same book remains doubtful<sup>2</sup>).

10 (21) This form of oath was first used for swearing obedience to the laws of Solon: Aristot. Ἀθπ. 7, 1 ἀναγράψαντες δὲ τοὺς νόμους εἰς τοὺς κύρβεις ἔστησαν ἐν τῇ στοᾷ τῆ βασιλείῳ, καὶ ὤμοσαν χρῆσασθαι πάντες· οἱ δ' ἑνέα ἄρχοντες ὀμνύντες πρὸς τῷ λίθῳ καταφάτιζον ἀναθήσειν ἀνδριάντα χρυσοῦν, εἴαν τινα παραβῶσι τῶν νόμων, ὅθεν ἔτι καὶ νῦν οὕτως ὀμνύουσι<sup>1</sup>). *Ibid.* 55, 5  
 15 (Pollux 8, 86) δοκιμασθέντες δὲ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον βαδίζουσι πρὸς τὸν λίθον, ἐφ' ᾧ (ἐφ' οὗ Bergk) τὰ τόμι' ἐστίν, ἐφ' οὗ καὶ οἱ διαιτηταὶ ὀμόσαντες ἀποφαίνονται τὰς διαίτας, καὶ οἱ μάρτυρες ἐξόμνυνται τὰς μαρτυρίας· ἀναβάντες δ' ἐπὶ τοῦτον ὀμνύουσιν δικαίως ἄρξειν καὶ κατὰ τοὺς νόμους, καὶ δῶρα μὴ λήψεσθαι τῆς ἀρχῆς ἕνεκα, κἄν τι λάβωσι ἀνδριάντα ἀναθήσειν χρυσοῦν. ἐντεῦθεν δ' ὀμόσαντες εἰς ἀκρόπολιν βαδίζουσι καὶ πάλιν ἐκεῖ ταῦτ' ὀμνύουσι· καὶ μετὰ ταῦτ' εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν εἰσέρχονται. Plutarch. *Solon* 25, 3  
 20 κοινὸν μὲν οὖν ὤμνυν ὄρκον ἢ βουλή τοὺς Σόλωνος νόμους ἐμπεδώσειν, ἰδίως δ' ἕκαστος τῶν θεσμοθετῶν ἐν ἀγοραῖ πρὸς τῷ λίθῳ, καταφατίζων εἰ τι παραβαίῃ τῶν θεσμῶν ἀνδριάντα χρυσοῦν ἰσομέτρητον ἀναθήσειν ἐν Δελφοῖς.  
 25 Whether Ph. gave the particulars exactly as Aristotle does remains doubtful in view of the nature of these lexicographical quotations; if he did Androtion may be the source common to both. His treatment of Solon, with the exception of the definition of σεισάχθεια F 114, is lost. Plutarch's source gives in addition to Aristotle's statements the god  
 30 who receives the penal statue; the source may not have followed the formula of the oath but Plato in *Phaedr.* 235 D ὡσπερ οἱ ἑνέα ἄρχοντες ὑπισχοῦμαι χρυσοῦν εἰκόνα ἰσομέτρητον εἰς Δελφοὺς ἀναθήσειν. His θεσμοθεταὶ instead of ἄρχοντες is rather a mannerism than a mistake; θεσμοὶ was probably the term used in the formula. His definition of the place is  
 35 less accurate. In the statement about the oath two facts seem to be fused: (1) an annual taking of the oath by the archons and also by the βουλή (ὤμνυν)<sup>2</sup> and (2) the first oath taken by the whole people (ὤμοσαν πάντες Aristot.; Ἀθηναῖοι Hdt. 1, 29) limited as to the time to perhaps hundred (Ἀθπ. 7, 2) or ten (Hdt.) years.

(22) Ἀγκυλῆσιν means the place where the statue stands and may (but need not necessarily) be taken from the inscription. The herm of Koropi<sup>1)</sup> set up by Hipparchos (?) ἐν μῆσοι Κεφαλῆς τε καὶ ἄστειος ἀγλαίας Ἑρμῆς does not furnish an argument for altering 'Ἐστῖαν ὁδόν<sup>2)</sup> to the name of the small deme Hestiaia; but the Τρικέφαλος certainly did stand at a meeting of roads like the Τετρακέφαλος ἐν τῇ τριόδῳ τῇ ἐν Κεραιμειῶν<sup>3)</sup>. Also it is doubtful whether the name of the dedicator Prokleides is taken from the inscription<sup>4)</sup> or from the tradition; in F 22a it has been corrupted by a kind of dittography, otherwise it is unknown<sup>5)</sup>. The fact of his being called Ἰππάρχου ἐραστής does not provide a date, for (1) it is not certain whether the dedication is connected chronologically with the setting up of inscribed herms by Hipparchos<sup>6)</sup>; (2) the setting up of this herm is not dated, and not necessarily to be dated later than 528-7 B.C. But the erotic relation, presumably derived from the (family?) tradition, may have been a thing of the past.

(23) The short section about the representatives of the κιθάριας ψαλῆ and its developments occurs between two quotations from Menaichmos of Sikyon<sup>1)</sup>, who mentioned many Sicyonians mostly unknown to us. Epigonos also is δημοποίητος Σικυώνιος<sup>2)</sup>; Lysandros<sup>3)</sup> who altered the nature of the κιθάριας ψαλῆ by introducing the chorus would also be expected in Menaichmos' book. The chronological relations are not quite certain, but Menaichmos most probably was a contemporary of Aristotle and wrote mainly before Ph. The latter may have discussed Lysandros in such detail because he was active in Athens, too, but hardly as early as at Solon's time<sup>4)</sup>, for the reform (establishment?) of the Panathenaia did not take place till 566/5 B.C.<sup>5)</sup>, and at Delphi the ψ. κ. was not introduced until 558/7 B.C.<sup>6)</sup>. Perhaps he lived under the sons of Peisistratos; the development makes it appear probable that the great reformer lived some considerable time after Aristonikos of Argos who 'introduced' such recitals, τῇ ἡλικίαι γινόμενος κατ' Ἀρχιλοχόν<sup>7)</sup>.

(24-29) The quotations of the names of six demes from the third book, to which may be added F 205/6 from Steph. Byz. without a number, points to Kleisthenes. Ph. evidently gave the total list<sup>1)</sup>, presumably not only of the original 100 (?) demes but of those of the fourth century or of his own time, too. He supplied notes explaining the names<sup>2)</sup>, probably also touching on other questions, partly of a topographical nature<sup>3)</sup>. How fully we cannot tell; his list presumably was the first<sup>4)</sup>.

(24) See (without a quotation) Hesych. s.v.; Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀλωπεκῆ; Synagoge (Suda) p 381, 17 Bkr. s.v. Ἀλωπεκῆθεν. The etymology of the

name is lost, and it seems to no purpose to guess. But cf. (1) Hesych. s.v. ἀλωπέκως· ἄμπελος οὕτω καλουμένη, καὶ ὁ ἀπ' αὐτῆς οἶνος; (2) Plin. *N.H.* 14, 42 *caudas vulpium imitata alopecis*; (3) Alopekos as a name in the Spartan legend about the cult image of Artemis Orthia Pausan. 5 3, 16, 7-9<sup>1</sup>).

(25) Again we do not learn what particulars Ph. was able to give about the hero. Pausan. 1, 3, 1 τὸ δὲ χωρίον ὁ Κεραμεικὸς τὸ μὲν ὄνομα ἔχει ἀπὸ ἥρωος Κεράμου, Διονύσου τε εἶναι καὶ Ἀριάδνης καὶ τούτου<sup>1</sup>) λεγομένου is transparent but hardly early. Certainly (for all Toepffer *A.G.* p. 257 n. 1 says to the contrary) something is at the bottom of Schol. Aristoph. *Ecc.* 253 ἦν δὲ Κεραμέως (κε-ν) πατὴρ (πατήρ Suda) ὁ Κέφαλος: Kephalos elsewhere is the son of Deion(eus), and Deion's daughter Dia is the mother of another eponym Πίτθος<sup>2</sup>).

(26) Pollux 7, 132 δύο γὰρ ὄντων Κολωνῶν ὁ μὲν Ἴππιος ἐκαλεῖτο, οὗ Σοφοκλῆς (*O.C.* 53 f.) μέμνηται . . . , ὁ δ' ἦν ἐν ἀγοραὶ παρὰ τὸ Εὐρυσάκειον, οὗ σνήμεσαν οἱ μισθαρνοῦντες κτλ. In fact, three demes of that name existed at least at the times of the emperors: Honigmann *R E XI* col. 1111 ff.; Judeich *Topogr.*<sup>3</sup> p. 168 n. 4. Of course, F 122 where Ph. does not even mention the Kolonos does not belong here.

(27) Presumably Ph. quoted Hesiod and Musaios (F 208), Melite not being easily explained. A Melite Ὀπλητος seems to have occurred in Phanodemos (325 F 5). About Myrmex, the eponymous hero of the Μύρμηκος ἀτραπὸς in the deme Skambonidai, and his genealogy see Wilamowitz *Ph. U.* 1 p. 146 f.; his father's name is Melanippos<sup>1</sup>), and Kleidemos (323 F 2) mentioned the Μελανίππειον in Melite. Melanippos was not a son of Theseus either according to Kleidemos or according to Ph., who on other occasions also endeavours to disentangle the maze of the Theseus problem<sup>2</sup>); but he was according to Asklepiades (12 F 8) who need not have invented the relationship.

(28) Something has become disarranged in the opening of this fragment: the deme Oie belongs to the Oineis<sup>1</sup>), the name of the deme of the Pandionis being Ὠα or Ὠά<sup>2</sup>). The article probably dealt with both; the citations, however, seem to refer to Oie, which is at present usually placed 'on the north margin of the Eleusinian plain', together with Thria and Phlye in the coastal trittys<sup>3</sup>), while Leake and Loeper looked for it 'in the Aigaleos and thus inside the city precinct' because the Python of the Kephalids was situated in the Aigaleos—not a very convincing reason.

(29) About etymologies in Ph. see *Introd.* p. 233. Ὀϊον (ὄϊον die

schafhürde, die καλύβια) der Kerameer' Wilamowitz *Ar. u. Ath.* II p. 156.

(30) To the three excerpts, which obviously go back to the same source (almost certainly Didymos) should be added Schol. Aristoph. *Eq.* 855 ὁ δὲ τρόπος τοιοῦτος τοῦ ἐξοστρακισμοῦ· προχειροτόνει ὁ δῆμος ὄστρακον εἰσφέρειν (Schoemann -ρων Schol), καὶ ὅταν δόξει ἐφράττετο σανίσιν ἢ ἀγορᾷ, καὶ κατελείποντο εἰσοδοὶ δέκα, δι' ὧν εἰσιόντες (οἱ εἰσ- V) κατὰ φυλάς ἐτίθεισαν ὄστρακον (-κα Θ), ἐντιθέντες τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν (ὑπογραφὴν Θ)· ἐπεστάτων δὲ οἱ τε ἄρχοντες καὶ ἡ βουλὴ. ἀριθμηθέντων δὲ ὧν πλεῖστα γένοιτο καὶ μὴ ἐλάττω (δὲ τῶν V) ἐξακισχιλίων, τοῦτον ἔδει ἐν δέκα ἡμέραις μεταστῆναι τῆς πόλεως· εἰ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο ἐξακισχίλια, οὐ μεθίστατο. οὐ μόνον δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι ὄστρακοφόρου, ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἀργεῖοι<sup>1</sup>) καὶ Μιλήσιοι καὶ Μεγαρεῖς. σχεδὸν δὲ οἱ χαριέστατοι πάντες ὄστρακίσθησαν, Ἀριστείδης, Κίμων, Θεμιστοκλῆς, Θουκυδίδης, Ἀλκιβιάδης. μέχρι δὲ Ὑπερβόλου ὄστρακισμὸς προελθὼν ἐπ' αὐτοῦ κατελύθη, μὴ ὑπακούσαντος τῷ νόμῳ διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῆν γεγενημένην τοῖς τῶν Ἀθηναίων πράγμασιν ὑπερον. Cf. also Pollux 8, 19 κοινῇ μέντοι πᾶς ὁ δῆμος ὄστράκοις ἐψηφίζετο, καὶ τὸ ἔργον ἐκαλεῖτο ὄστρακοφορία, καὶ τὸ πάθος ὄστρακισμὸς, καὶ τὸ ῥῆμα ἐξοστρακίσαι καὶ ἐξοστρακισθῆναι. (20) περισχονίσαντας δὲ τι τῆς ἀγορᾶς μέρος ἔδει φέρειν εἰς τὸν περιορισθέντα τόπον Ἀθηναίων τὸν βουλλόμενον ὄστρακον ἐγγεγραμμένον τοῦνομα τοῦ μέλλοντος ἐξοστρακίζεσθαι· ὅτωι δὲ ἐξακισχίλια γένοιτο τὰ ὄστρακα, τοῦτον φυγεῖν ἐχρήν, οὐχ ὡς κατεγνωσμένον ἀλλ' ὡς τῇ πολιτείᾳ βαρύτερον, δι' ἀρετῆς φόβον μᾶλλον ἢ διὰ κακίας ψόγον<sup>2</sup>). Plutarch. *Aristeid.* 7, 2 ἐξοστρακίζουσι τὸν Ἀριστείδην, ὄνομα τῷ φόβῳ τῆς δόξης φόβον τυραννίδος θέμενοι. μοχθηρίας γὰρ οὐκ ἦν κόλασις ὁ ἐξοστρακισμὸς . . . ἦν δὲ φόβου παραμυθία φιλόφρωνος, εἰς ἀνήκεστον οὐδὲν ἀλλ' εἰς μετάστασιν ἐτῶν δέκα τὴν πρὸς τὸ λυποῦν ἀπεριδομένον δυσμένειαν. (3) ὅτε δὲ ἤρξαντο τινες ἀνθρώπου ἀγενεῖς καὶ πονηροὺς ὑποβάλλειν τῷ πράγματι, τελευταῖον ἀπάντων Ὑπερβόλον ἐξοστρακίσαντες ἐπαύσαντο . . . (5) ἦν δὲ τοιοῦτον ὡς τύπῳ φράσαι τὸ γινόμενον· ὄστρακον ἕκαστος λαβὼν καὶ γράψας ὃν ἐβούλετο μεταστῆσαι τῶν πολιτῶν ἔφερεν εἰς ἓνα τόπον τῆς ἀγορᾶς περιπεφραγμένον ἐν κύκλῳ δρυφράκοις. (6) οἱ δ' ἄρχοντες πρῶτον μὲν διηριθμοῦν τὸ σῦμπαν ἐν ταῦτῳ τῶν ὄστράκων πλῆθος· εἰ γὰρ ἐξακισχιλίων ἐλάττωτες οἱ φέροντες (S<sup>r</sup> γράψαντες S<sup>m</sup> Y) εἴεν, ἀτελής ἦν ὁ ἐξοστρακισμὸς. ἔπειτα τῶν ὀνομάτων ἕκαστον ἰδίᾳ τιθέντες τὸν ὑπὸ τῶν πλείστον γεγραμμένον ἐξεκέρυττον εἰς ἕτη δέκα, καρπούμενον τὰ αὐτοῦ<sup>3</sup>). Diodor. II, 55 a. 471/0 B.C. (surely from Ephoros) πρῶτον μὲν οὖν αὐτὸν (scil. Θεμιστοκλέα) ἐκ τῆς πόλεως μετέστησαν, τοῦτον τὸν ὀνομαζόμενον ὄστρακισμὸν ἐπαγαγόντες αὐτῷ, ὃς ἐνομοθετήθη μὲν . . . μετὰ τὴν κατάλυσιν τῶν τυράνων . . . (2) ὁ δὲ νόμος ἐγένετο τοιοῦτος·

ἕκαστος τῶν πολιτῶν εἰς δοτρακον ἔγραφε τοῦνομα τοῦ δοκοῦντος μάλιστα δύνασθαι καταλύσαι τὴν δημοκρατίαν· οἱ δ' ἂν δοτρακα πλείω γένηται <ἐξακισχιλίων> φεύγειν ἐκ τῆς πατρίδος ἐτέτακτο πενταετῆ (sic) χρόνον. (3) νομοθεῆσαι δὲ ταῦτα δοκοῦσιν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι οὐχ ἵνα τὴν κακίαν κολάζω-  
 5 σιν, ἀλλ' ἵνα τὰ φρονήματα τῶν ὑπερεχόντων ταπεινότερα γένηται διὰ τὴν φυγῆν.

F 30 consists of two parts: (1) a technical one (p. 107, 14-24) in which Ph. describes the mode of procedure <sup>4</sup>); (2) a historical one, which is incomplete <sup>5</sup>) and probably not (or at least not immediately) taken from  
 10 Ph. It is, of course, not impossible that he gave a general summary, perhaps when the procedure was first, or when it was for the last time, put into practice <sup>6</sup>); but he must have entered the passing of the law and each ostracism under its proper year. As he is quoted for the procedure only and its legal consequences, we cannot prove that he regarded the  
 15 law as Cleisthenian, though it is probable that he did, for the *Althides* seem to agree, apart from Androtion who changed the date arbitrarily with a definite purpose <sup>7</sup>). προεχειροτόνει - εισφέρειν] The preliminary vote is also known to Aristotle Ἀθπ. 43, 5: ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς ἑκτῆς πρυτανείας . . . καὶ περὶ τῆς δοτρακοφορίας ἐπιχειροτονίαν <sup>8</sup>) διδάσκειν, εἰ δοκεῖ ποιεῖν ἢ μή-  
 20 We understand why Ph. and Aristotle date different stages of the proceedings, for the former is concerned with the procedure itself, the latter with the order of the day of the κυρία ἐκκλησία <sup>9</sup>). But the form of Ph.'s dating is surprising <sup>10</sup>); it surely is an abbreviation of a more accurate text—προεχειροτόνει μὲν ὁ δῆμος <ἐπὶ τῆς ᾗ πρυτανείας> εἰ—εισφέ-  
 25 ρειν· ὅτε δ' ἐδόκει, <ἐπὶ τῆς ἧ πρυτανείας> ἐφράσσετο κτλ., or whatever the wording was. This combination—preliminary vote in the 6th, final voting in the 8th prytany—is more credible than the assumption of a graver corruption. But we do not know the reason of the interval; the suggestion that it was meant as a caution 'contre les variations d'une opinion  
 30 mobile et passionnée' <sup>11</sup>), seems trivial. μὴ ἐλάττω ἐξακισχιλίων] The number 6000 is common to the entire tradition. But according to Plutarch, who gives an accurate account, it is a quorum: if there were less than 6000 voters the ostracism did not come off; otherwise whoever received the majority of the votes (*i.e.* at least 3001) was held to be  
 35 ostracised. The description of the double counting of the votes is lucid and appears correct, no matter where Plutarch got it <sup>12</sup>); a misunderstanding is hardly conceivable. But in Ph. matters are different. The excerpts <sup>13</sup>) know one counting only, and they clearly assert that 'whoever received the majority of the votes *and* not less than 6000' was held to be



ostracised. Now, of course, a difference of opinion as to the matter is conceivable, for as early as Kleidemos' time the proceedings had been obsolete for sixty years, and Hellanikos in his two books can hardly be presumed to have given technically accurate and detailed descriptions of Attic institutions. It is not at all probable that Didymos misunderstood Ph. whose books he consulted directly and usually excerpted verbatim; the only credible assumption seems to me that here again an abridgement on the part of the lexicographer of e.g. *καὶ μὴ ἐλάττω ἐξάκισ-χίλων* <δυντων τῶν φερόντων ὄστρακων> led to a misunderstanding which I<sup>14</sup>) should not like to impute to Ph. In any case, we shall readily acquit Ph. of the mistake, for the fact that 6000 was a kind of normal number for the total of the Athenian people qualified to vote decisively favours the version of Plutarch: the same quorum is required for the treatment of other affairs by the Ekklesia<sup>15</sup>), and 6000 is the number of the jurymen who in certain cases judge in a body and may then be considered to represent the whole people<sup>16</sup>). *ἔτη δέκα*] The ten years are certain: Plutarch above p. 315, 35; Schol. Aristoph. *Vesp.* 947 τοῦτον (*scil.* Θεουκιδίδην) δὲ ἐξωστράκισαν Ἀθηναῖοι τὰ ἔτη κατὰ τὸν νόμον; cf. Plato *Gorg.* p. 516 D; Ps. Andokid. 4, 2; Plutarch. *Nikias* II, 1. When Aristot. *Pol.* 3, 8, 2 avoids the number by χρόνους ὀρισμένους, he merely does so because he is speaking of other places besides Athens; the petalism in Syracuse prescribed 5 years<sup>17</sup>). Whether Ephoros above p. 316, 3 has confused ostracism and petalism may remain undiscussed; there always remains the possibility of a wrong conclusion from the wrong date of Kimon's return to Athens. Theopompos II 5 F 96 ἐξωστράκισαν τὸν Ὑπέρολον ἐξ ἔτη must have believed that the time was fixed in each individual case, if the fragment is a verbatim quotation and if the number in the scholion is intact. We may doubt this, for II 5 F 88 οὐδέπω δὲ ἔ ἐτῶν παρεληλυθότων . . . ὁ δῆμος μετεπέμψατο Κίμωνα makes it appear at least possible that he believed five years to have been the normal number, though in this case we should expect the definite article τῶν ἔ ἐτῶν. Ph. must not be judged capable of such an error; we shall again have to assume a misunderstanding through abbreviation: perhaps Ephoros or Theopompos was quoted for the five years, and the lexicographer wrote ὄστρακον, having drawn a wrong conclusion from the discrepancy. ἐντὸς Γεραιστοῦ] One point does not easily provide a boundary; the great gap may have absorbed the second, preserved by Aristotle Ἀθπ. 22, 8 (on 481/0 B.C.) καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν ὄρισαν τοῖς ὄστρακίζομένοις ἐντὸς Γεραιστοῦ καὶ Σκυλλαίου κατοικεῖν, ἢ ἀτίμους εἶναι καθάπαξ. But the real difficulty

is whether ἐντός is correct as two excerpts of Ph.'s text present the variant (or correction) ἐντός πέρα τοῦ<sup>18</sup>).

(31) The name Κέβρις is unique like many others in the early list of archons and elsewhere. Wilamowitz *Herm.* 21 p. 600 n. 2 explained it 5 as a 'hypokoristikon' of Kebrioneus and referred to the connection of Athens with Kebrione in the sixth century B.C.<sup>1</sup>). The date cannot be determined: in the list of archons between Isagoras in 508/7 B.C. and Hipparchos in 496/5 and even in the 'eighties there are a number of gaps, and there are more between Solon and Isagoras. Nothing tells in 10 favour of precisely the 'first years of the fifth century'<sup>2</sup>); the period of the Pisistratids<sup>3</sup>) is possible and perhaps more probable. Ph. mentioned the Ἀγοραῖος as he did the Τρικέφαλος F 22, because it was one of the few monuments which had 'escaped the Persian destruction'<sup>4</sup>). I do not doubt that he took the name of the archon from the inscription, 15 and that it was the archon himself who had dedicated the statue. Here and elsewhere this seems to me more credible than that 'the Chronicle took notice of the dedication'<sup>5</sup>). It should never be forgotten that Ph. collected Ἐπιγράμματα Ἀττικά. Pausan. I, 15, 1 ἰοῦσι δὲ πρὸς τὴν στο- 20 ἀν . . . Ποικίλην . . . ἔστιν Ἑρμῆς χαλκοῦς καλούμενος Ἀγοραῖος καὶ πύλη πλησίον<sup>6</sup>). ἐπεσι δὲ οἱ (i.e. τῆι πύλῃ) τρόπαιον Ἀθηναίων ἵππομαχίαι κρατησάντων Πλεισταρχον κτλ. Lucian *Juiff. Trag.* 33 ὁ χαλκοῦς, ὁ εὐγραμ- 25 μος καὶ εὐπεριγραπτος, ὁ ἀρχαῖος τὴν ἀνάδησιν τῆς κόμης . . . ὁ σός, ὁ Ἑρμῆ, ἀδελφός ἐστιν, ὁ ἀγοραῖος, ὁ παρὰ τὴν Ποικίλην· πίττης γοῦν ἀναπέ- πλησται ὀσημέραι ἐκματτόμενος ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνδριαντοποιῶν κτλ. Schol. Aristoph. 25 *Eq.* 297 (Suda s.v.) ἐν μέσση γὰρ τῆι ἀγοραῖ ἱδρυται Ἑρμοῦ Ἀγοραίου ἀγαλ- μα. Schol. Lucian. p. 70, 20 R Ἑρμῆς ὁ Ἀγοραῖος ἐτιμᾶτο παρὰ τοῖς Ἀθη- ναίοις ὡς ἐν τῆι ἀγοραῖ ἱδρυμένος. Synagoge p. 339, 1 Bkr Ἀγοραῖος Ἑρμῆς ἐν Ἀθήνησιν ἱδρυτο κατὰ τὴν ἀγοράν. It is by him that the ἀλλαν- 30 τοπώλης Aristoph. *Eq.* 297 swears; and to him Kallistratos (more probably the hipparchos of the Sicilian expedition than the orator of the fourth century<sup>7</sup>) dedicated an altar.

(32) This is one fragment. Thea does not exist, and Θεεῖς seems to be corrupted from a Thucydidean Αἰθεεῖς<sup>1</sup>), not from Θουριεῖς, whom Thukydides calls Θουριάται: I, 101, 2 Θουριάται τε καὶ Αἰθ(ν)εεῖς ἐς Ἰθώ- 35 μην ἀπέστησαν. But whether we have here two towns of perioeci or only one, the relation to the rising of the helots in 464 B.C. seems to be certain. The importance for Athens which Ph. attached to that event may be judged from F 117.

(33) Schol. Demosth. 3, 11; Et. (Gen.) M. p. 448, 47 ff.; Lex. rhet.

p. 264, 7 Bkr.; Suda s.v. (© 218/20); Phot. s.v. About the origin of the institution the Etymologicum (from scholia on Demosth. 18, 28?) states: ἐν ταῖς λεγομέναις Διονυσίαις θεωρίαις ἀγώνων τελουμένων φιλοτίμων, συνέβαινε τινὰς τῶν πολιτῶν εἰς ὕβρεις καὶ τραύματα διαφέρεσθαι· ἔδοξεν οὖν 5 τῷ δήμῳ μηκέτι θεωρεῖν τὰς θεάς προκαταλαμβάνοντα (τῶν ξένων τὰς θεὰς προκαταλαμβάνοντων Sud) ἀλλὰ δίδοναι τοῖς πολῖταις τὸ θεωρικόν, ὅπερ ἦσαν δύο ὄβελοί <sup>1)</sup>), ἵνα τοῦτο λαμβάνοντες οἱ πολῖται διδάσκει μισθὸν αὐτῇ τῇ πόλει, μισθὸν τῆς θεάς. It is regrettable that through the laziness of the excerptor we have lost the full account of Ph., which presumably 10 was not quite brief. πρῶτον and πρότερον (if θεωρικά — 'Αγύρριος ὁ δημαγωγός belongs to the excerpt from Ph.) shows that he gave a history of this item of the budget which, judging from the drafting of the whole sentence, was probably given at the time of Demosthenes, i.e. in the sixth book <sup>2)</sup>): Ph. (F 56) reported the resolution τὰ χρήματα 15 πάντ' εἶναι στρατιωτικά, Δημοσθένους γράψαντος under the year of Lysimachides 339/8 B.C. As Didymos excerpted merely τὰ ἀναγκαϊότατα there would be room for a digression here, but it may have occurred earlier, for the question was urgent during the whole administration of Eubulos in 354/339 B.C. <sup>3)</sup>). The alteration of Γ̄ to F̄ seems indicated. The increase 20 of the payment to one drachm took place in 395/4 B.C.: Hesych. s.v. δραχμῆ χαλαζῶσα; Zenob. Prov. 3, 27 ἐπὶ Διοφάντου τὸ θεωρικὸν ἐγένετο δραχμῆ. The mover presumably was Agyrrhios <sup>4)</sup>). The date of the first introduction cannot be determined with certainty, but in no case does it fall in the sixties of the fifth century B.C.; Boeckh *l.c.* p. 15 was wrong 25 to assign it to 469/8 B.C.: neither does 'the administration of Perikles begin about 469/8' nor is Plutarch. *Perikles* 9 a sufficient foundation for dating the event earlier than the overthrow of the Areopagos. Plutarch has here no documentary dates; he is working with anti-Periclean literature (which moves Ephialtes into the background) and its anecdotic 30 contrast between Kimon who was liberal out of his own property and Perikles who, Damon advising, θεωρικοῖς καὶ δικαστικοῖς λήμμασιν ἄλλαις τε μισθοφοραῖς καὶ χορηγίαις συνδεκάσας τὸ πλῆθος ἐχρήτο κατὰ τῆς ἐξ 'Αρείου πάγου βουλῆς <sup>5)</sup>). It must be taken into account that Aristotle in the same context <sup>6)</sup> only mentions the payment of the jurymen which, in my opinion, cannot have been introduced until 449/8 B.C. In regard to the 35 θεωρικόν, too, general considerations lead with greater probability to (the first half of) the 'forties <sup>7)</sup>). In any case, the period of 454-449 B.C. <sup>8)</sup> cannot be proved: the *terminus ante* is uncertain because we do not know the concluding point; it becomes even more uncertain if we are

obliged to doubt the number of the book, and the *terminus post* alone does not help <sup>2)</sup>).

- (34) Hesych. s.v. ἱερὸν πόλεμον· ὃν ἐπολέμησαν Λακεδαιμόνιοι πρὸς Φωκέας ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐν Δελφοῖς ἱεροῦ. ἐβοήθησαν δὲ Φωκεῦσιν Ἄθηναῖοι, καὶ παρέδωκαν τὸ ἱερὸν. Thukyd. I, 112, 5 Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα (*scil.* the death of Kimon and the return of the Athenian ships from Cyprus and Egypt) τὸν ἱερὸν καλούμενον πόλεμον ἐστράτευσαν, καὶ κρατήσαντες τοῦ ἐν Δελφοῖς ἱεροῦ παρέδωκαν Δελφοῖς <sup>1)</sup>). καὶ αὖθις ὕστερον Ἄθηναῖοι ἀποχωρησάντων αὐτῶν στρατεύσαντες καὶ κρατήσαντες παρέδωκαν Φωκεῦσιν.
- 10 Plutarch. *Perikl.* 21 μέγα ἔργον ἠγούμενος ἀνείργειν Λακεδαιμονίους καὶ ὅλως ὑπεναντιούμενος ἐκείνοις ὡς ἄλλοις τε πολλοῖς ἔδειξε καὶ μάλιστα τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ἱερὸν πραχθεῖσι πόλεμον. (2) ἐπεὶ γὰρ οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι στρατεύσαντες εἰς Δελφοὺς Φωκέων ἐχόντων τὸ ἱερὸν Δελφοῖς ἀπέδωκαν, εὐθύς ἐκείνων ἀπαλλαγέντων ὁ Περικλῆς ἐπιστρατεύσας πάλιν εἰσήγαγε τοὺς Φωκέας.
- 15 (3) καὶ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων ἦν ἔδωκαν αὐτοῖς Δελφοὶ προμαντεῖαν εἰς τὸ μέτωπον ἐγκολαψάντων (ἐγκ- Juntina ἐκκ- ο) τοῦ χαλκοῦ λύκου, λαβῶν καὶ αὐτὸς προμαντεῖαν τοῖς Ἄθηναίοις εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν λύκον κατὰ τὴν δεξιὰν πλευρὰν ἐνεχάραξεν. The question of the absolute chronology still remains dubious. But certainly Plutarch('s authority) has rightly understood
- 20 the Thucydidean αὖθις ὕστερον when he says εὐθύς. Consequently τρίτωι ἔτει in the careless excerpt (which must not in its whole contents be ascribed to Ph. <sup>2)</sup>) is incredible <sup>3)</sup>, whether ἔτει be a mistake for μηνί, or whether it is taken from Thukyd. I, 112, 1 ὕστερον δὲ διαλιπόντων ἐτῶν τριῶν σπονδαὶ γίνονται Πελοποννησίοις καὶ Ἄθηναίοις πεντέτεσι. Similarly
- 25 the Boeotians in a as adversaries may have been taken from ch.s III and 113. The Athenian campaign must have followed the Spartan at a short interval, but it may have fallen in the next Attic year: the Spartan in 449/8 B.C., the Athenian in 448/7 B.C. <sup>4)</sup>).

- (35) Δικ. ὄνομ. p. 191, 26 Bkr: ὀργεῶνες εἰσιν οἱ κοινωνοῦντες ἀλλήλοις
- 30 θεῶν ἢ ἡρώων ἐν ἱεροῖς καὶ κοινῇ θυηπολοῦντες, ὡς Δεῖναρχος (Ruhnken Χάρης Ms.) λέγει ἐν τῷ Κατὰ Διονυσίου. καὶ πάλιν ὀργεῶνες τίνες ἐν Ἀπολογίαι ὕβρεως σαφὲς ποιεῖ. οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀφιδρυσμένοις θεοῖς ὀργιάζοντες καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν δὲ κρίνοντες ὀργεῶνας ἑαυτοὺς ἀλλήλους ἐκάλουν. Haprockr. (Suda) s.v. ὀργεῶνας· Ἰσαίου λόγος ἐστὶ Πρὸς (ἐστὶν ὡς
- 35 Sud) ὀργεῶνας. ὀργεῶνες δ' εἰσιν οἱ ἐπὶ τιμῇ θεῶν ἢ ἡρώων συνιόντες· ὀργιάζειν γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ θύειν καὶ τὰ νομιζόμενα δρᾶν (Val ὀρᾶν Hap Sud) . . . . (etymologies). οἱ μέντοι ποιηταὶ ἔταττον τούνομα ἀπλῶς ἐπὶ τῶν ἱερῶν, ὡς Ἀντίμαχος τέ που (F 67 Wyss) καὶ Αἰσχύλος ἐν Μυσοῖς (F 144 N<sup>2</sup>). μήποτε δὲ ὕστερον νερόμισται τὸ ἐπὶ τιμῇ τινὰς τῶν ἀποθανόντων συνιέναι καὶ ὀργεῶνας

- ὁμοίως ὠνομάσθαι, ὡς ἐστὶ συνιδεῖν ἐκ τῶν Θεοφράστου διαθηκῶν<sup>1)</sup>. *Lex. rhet.* P. 286, II Bkr (Phot. Suda) ὀργεῶνες· σύνταγμά τι ἀνδρῶν ὅσωνδὴ ὡς τὸ τῶν γεννητῶν καὶ φρατῶρων. ὠνομάσθη δὲ οὕτως ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινῆι ὀργιάζειν, ὃ θύειν ἐστὶν ἢ εὐχεσθαι. Pollux 6, 156 οἱ γὰρ ὁμογάλακτες ἴδιον τῶν Ἰωνικῶν. Phot. s.v. ὁμογάλακτες· οἱ τοῦ αὐτοῦ γάλακτος, οὗς καὶ γεννήτας ἐκάλουσαν. Hesych. s.v. οἱ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ γένους· ἢ ἀδελφοί. Schol. Plat. *Kriton* p. 51 E γεννῆται οἱ τοῦ αὐτοῦ γένους μετέχοντες καὶ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἔχοντες κοινὰ ἱερά· οἱ δὲ ὁμογάλακτας, φράτορας, συγγενεῖς τοὺς γεννήτας. Pollux 8, III οἱ φυλοβασιλεῖς· ἐξ εὐπατριδῶν δὲ ὄντες μάλιστα τῶν ἱερῶν ἐπεμελοῦντο . . . ὅτε μέντοι τέτταρες ἦσαν αἱ φυλαί, εἰς τρία μέρη ἐκάστη διήρητο, καὶ τὸ μέρος τοῦτο ἐκαλεῖτο τριττύς καὶ ἔθνος καὶ φρατρία· καὶ οἱ μετέχοντες τοῦ γένους γεννῆται καὶ ὁμογάλακτες, γένει μὲν οὐ προσήκοντες, ἐκ δὲ τῆς συνόδου οὕτω προσαγορευόμενοι. τρία δ' ἦν τὰ ἔθνη πάσαι· εὐπατρίδαι, γεωμῆροι, δημιουργοί. *Aristot. Pol.*
- 15 I, I, 6-7 ἢ μὲν οὖν εἰς πᾶσαν ἡμέραν συνεστηκυῖα κοινωνία κατὰ φύσιν οἰκός ἐστιν, οὗς Χαράνδας μὲν καλεῖ ὁμοσιπούς, Ἐπιμενίδης δὲ ὁ Κρής (457 F 20) ὁμοκάπ(ν)ους· ἢ δ' ἐκ πλείωνων οἰκιῶν κοινωνία . . . κόμη. μάλιστα δὲ κατὰ φύσιν εἰσὶν ἢ κόμη ἀποικία οἰκίας εἶναι, οὗς καλοῦσιν οὐκ ὁμογάλακτας, παῖδάς τε καὶ παίδων παῖδας.
- 20 It is impossible to enter here into a discussion on the structure of the archaic social community of Athens, or into the question of its aristocracy<sup>2)</sup>; we shall have to confine ourselves to the interpretation of the fragment of Ph. which, quoted as it is from the fourth book, Boeckh was certainly right in connecting with Peikles' citizen law of 451/0 B.C.
- 25 and/or the examination of the list of citizens in 445/4 B.C.<sup>3)</sup> Obviously Ph. on this occasion inserted one of his systematic digressions<sup>4)</sup>, more of which are found in the fourth book. There is no need to change the  $\bar{\Delta}$  of F 35b to  $\bar{\Lambda}$  or  $\delta$  (εὐτέρωι), because phylai, phratries, trittyes, gené, perhaps even ethnos, gennetai, homogalaktes were discussed in the first
- 30 part of Aristotle's *'Aθn.*—an *Atthis* is neither a Πολιτεία nor a modern handbook. The digression must have been fairly long, because the classification of the Athenian people for political purposes and for purposes of family law was described as to its development. What has remained of it is merely the fragment of a law, presumably Solonian<sup>5)</sup>,
- 35 and it may have been Ph. himself who explained the obsolete term ὁμογάλακτες by γεννῆται<sup>6)</sup>. Neither the sense of the law nor Ph.'s conception of it are forthwith clear, but first of all it is evident that Ph. discussed the phratry, the civic unit which had survived the Cleisthenian reform: the fact of a man belonging to a phratry at once proved that he

was a citizen <sup>7</sup>). Without keeping strictly to the explanation *ὁμογάλακτες* = *γεννῆται* the very wording seems to allow of one interpretation only: it is not that the phratores (regarded as existing) include *ὄργεῶνες* and *ὁμογάλακτες*, but they are to admit *ὄργεῶνες* as well as *ὁμογάλακτες* if <sup>5</sup> the former present themselves for inscription. *ὄργεῶνες* and *ὁμογάλακτες*, taken together, constitute the people as a whole, or rather they are to constitute it from that time onward. The new and essential feature is that the old phratries are enjoined (*ἐπάναγκες*) to admit also the *ὄργεῶνες*. The provision thus becomes the fundamental law of the State; it creates <sup>10</sup> the (new) conception of the Athenian citizen <sup>8</sup>). Provided one bears in mind that this notion is a new one, one may loosely use the terms old and new citizens: by being admitted into the phratries the *orgeones* become citizens. The law thus created the foundation for the division of the whole people into four tax-classes (*τέλη*) all of which have a share <sup>15</sup> in the *ἐκκλησία καὶ δικαστήρια* <sup>9</sup>). The real difficulty does not arise until we now put the question who were, according to Ph., the old citizens, whom the law called *ὁμογάλακτες*. Ph. says: 'those whom we now call *γεννῆται*'. But our sources use the term *γεννῆται* in different ways: (1) according to Aristotle <sup>10</sup>) the *γένος* is quite an artificial division. It <sup>20</sup> should, however, be observed that he seems to have mentioned only the *γένος*, and that it is Pollux (above p. 321, 9 ff.) who was the first to introduce *γεννῆται* and *ὁμογάλακτες*, but who distinctly states at the same time that they are united to a *γένος* not on the basis of blood-relationship <sup>11</sup>). This *γένος* and these *γεννῆται* are a perfect parallel to the *ὄρ-* <sup>25</sup> *γεῶνες*, whose connexion is founded on their worship of the same deity <sup>12</sup>): the Lexeis quoted above p. 321, 1 ff. place the *συντάγματα* of the *orgeones*, *gennetai*, *phratores* alongside of each other as being homogeneous, and Schol. Plat. (above p. 321, 6 ff.) determine the *gennetai* also as *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἔχοντες κοινὰ ἱερά*. (2) The *γεννῆται* (for that is the term discussed <sup>30</sup> at least primarily, not the *γένος*) are relations by blood like the *ὁμογάλακτες* in Aristotle's *Politics* (above p. 321, 14 ff.): thus Harpokration, Photios, Hesych, and the first definition in the Scholia on Platon: they are *ἐξ αἵματος γεννῆται* because they belong to the same *γένος* and have the same ancestor. Naturally one thinks here of the aristocratic clans, <sup>35</sup> the *γένη* proper, the eupatrids: actually the Patmian Lexicon (copied in the app. crit.; it is not Aristotle) mentions as examples the Eumolpids, Ceryces, Eteobutads, and Pollux attaches his explanation to the *φυλοβασικῆς ἐξ εὐπατριδῶν*. Harpokration (F 35b) only seemingly makes difficulties: his reason for criticising Isaios is that as early as in the

fourth century γένος and γεννῆται were abusively applied to every blood-relationship<sup>13</sup>). In view of this loose usage of the word the lexicographer stresses the difference between συγγενεῖς and γεννῆται: mere blood-relationship is not enough to justify the designation γεννῆται, which (κυρίως) means the members of an (old) clan. The controversy has become obscured because the Aristotelian conception is brought in; and this probably is a consequence of severe abbreviation of the article. We probably should not have to raise the question of how Ph. wished his γεννῆται to be understood if we had the context in which he quoted the law. The *a priori* assumption that he agreed with Aristotle is not justified. The fact that he uses the term γεννῆται for the explanation of ὁμογάλακτες even seems to prove the contrary, for it is understandable to find blood-relationship in that enigmatical term. It is another question whether this is correct. In Aristotle's opinion the ὁμογάλακτες are relatives by line of descent: παῖδες τε καὶ παίδων παῖδες<sup>14</sup>), but the difference is that Aristotle understands the term quite generally (as Isaios understood the gennetai simply as relatives, συγγενεῖς) whereas Ph. probably, or rather certainly, understood it as 'those belonging to the clans'. He interpreted the law as an order that the phratries, in addition to the old families, whose connexion was founded on 'milk-brotherhood' = blood-brotherhood<sup>15</sup>), in future had to admit the orgeones, whose connexion was merely founded on a community of cult<sup>16</sup>).

(36) Plutarch. *Perikl.* 13, 12/3 τὰ δὲ προπύλαια τῆς ἀκροπόλεως ἐξείρη- γάσθη μὲν ἐν πενταεταίᾳ Μνησικλέους ἀρχιτεκτονούντος, τύχη δὲ θαυμαστῇ  
 25 συμβᾶσα περὶ τὴν οἰκοδομίαν ἐμήνυσε τὴν θεὸν οὐκ ἀποστατοῦσαν ἀλλὰ συν- εφαιπτομένην τοῦ ἔργου καὶ συνεπιτελοῦσαν. ὁ γὰρ ἐνεργότατος καὶ προθυμότατος τῶν τεχνιτῶν ἀποσφαλεῖς ἐξ ὕψους ἔπεσε, καὶ διέκειτο μοχθηρῶς ὑπὸ τῶν ἰατρῶν ἀπεγνωσμένος· ἀθυμούντος δὲ τοῦ Περικλέους ἡ θεὸς ὄναρ φανεῖσα συνέταξε  
 30 θεραπείαν, ἦι χρώμενος ὁ Περικλῆς ταχὺ καὶ ραϊδίως ἴασατο τὸν ἄνθρωπον. ἐπὶ τούτῳ δὲ καὶ τὸ χαλκοῦν ἄγαλμα τῆς Ὑγίαιας Ἀθηναῖς ἀνέστησεν ἐν ἀκροπόλει παρὰ τὸν βωμόν, ὃς καὶ πρότερον ἦν, ὡς λέγουσιν<sup>1</sup>). As the lexicographer quotes a special author for the duration and the total costs of the building, we may infer that Ph. merely gave one of his brief annual entries, but he certainly mentioned the mover of the relevant decree<sup>2</sup>). We shall  
 35 not assign to him the typical story of miraculous healing, if only because it is due to a mistake as to the facts: we know from *I G<sup>2</sup> I 395* Ἀθηναῖοι τῇ Ἀθηναίᾳ τῇ Ὑγίαιᾳ· Πύρρος ἐποίησεν Ἀθηναῖος that the cult image was dedicated not by Perikles but by the people. Ph. may also have entered the dedication of that image, but our tradition fails: Harpokr.

s.v. Ὑγεία Ἀθηναῖα does not yield anything beyond ἐπώνυμον τῆς Ἀθηναῖς<sup>3)</sup>. The transference to Perikles is a λεγόμενον, presumably late verger's wisdom. A variant, legendary too, but nearer to the facts is cited in Plin. *N. H.* 22, 44 *verna carus Pericli . . . , cum is in arce templum aedificaret repsissetque super altitudinem fastigii et inde cecidisset, hac herba dicitur sanatus, monstrata Pericli somnio a Minerva; quare parthenium vocari coepta est, adsignaturque ei deae. hic est vernula, cuius effigies ex aere fusa est et nobilis ille splanchnoptes<sup>4)</sup>.*

(37) Hesych. s.v. Λύκρον· τόπος, Περικλέους ἐπιστατήσαντος τοῦ ἔργου. 10 ἐποιοῦντο δὲ αὐτόθι τὰς στρατιωτικὰς ἐξετάσεις καὶ συλλόγους<sup>1)</sup>. The date of the building is dubious; the first (uncertain) mention in the 'thirties (?) occurs in Diog. Laert. 9, 54 ἀνέγνω δ' Ἀθήνησιν (*scil.* Πρωταγόρας τὸν Περὶ θεῶν λόγον) ἐν τῇ Εὐριπίδου οἰκίᾳ ἤ, ὡς τινες, ἐν τῇ Μεγακλείδου· ἄλλοι <δ> ἐν Λυκείῳ; the next *IG<sup>2</sup> I 114, 35 a.* 410/8 B.C. The statement Περικλέ- 15 οὺς ἐπιστατοῦντος<sup>2)</sup>, of course, is documentary, and Judeich *Topogr.*<sup>2</sup> p. 415 is doubtful about Peisistratos. About the later building activity of Lykurgos in this place see *ib.* p. 87.

(38-39) Et. M. p. 369, 15; Harpokr. s.v. ἐπώνυμοι (*Lex. rhet.* p. 245, 17 Bkr); Schol. Aristoph. *Pac.* 1183 τόπος Ἀθήνησιν παρὰ πρυτανεῖον<sup>1)</sup>, 20 ἐν ᾧ ἐστήκασιν ἀνδριάντες, οὓς ἐπώνυμους καλοῦσιν. ἐπειδὴν οὖν κατάλογον δεήσει γενέσθαι στρατείας, προσγράφοντες<sup>2)</sup> τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν καταλεγόμενων ἐπὶ ἐνὸς προτιθέασι τούτων τῶν ἀνδριάντων ὑπὲρ τοῦ φανερόν ἐκεῖσε γενέσθαι τοῖς καταλεγόμενοις. Boeckh certainly placed this fragment correctly because of Thukyd. 2, 13 where, before the proper outbreak of the war 25 (ἔτι τῶν Πελοποννησίων ξυλληγομένων) Perikles states the military strength of Athens: ὀπλίτας δὲ . . . ἀπό τε τῶν πρεσβυτάτων καὶ τῶν νεωά- των . . . ἰππέας δὲ ἀπέφαινε διακοσίους καὶ χίλιους ζὺν ἰπποτοξόταις. We may assume that Ph. here, too, wrote a digression about the organi- zation of the Athenian army, which probably went considerably beyond 30 the summary statements of Thukydides sufficient for the latter's purpose. Unfortunately the excerptor of Harpokration, who begins to abbreviate even before the end of the excerpt from Aristotle, was again too lazy to copy the longer passage. Thus we are unable to learn whether Ph. gave a history of the organization from the Kleisthenian time onwards, 35 and whether he summed up, on this occasion, the development of the fleet. It may be noticed that Aristotle Ἀθπ. 53, 4 knew about an external change of the muster-roll, the substitution of the λελευκωμένα γραμμα- τεῖα by στῆλαι χαλκαῖ; Ph. hardly was the first to mention this use made of the ἐπώνυμοι.



(40) The very name of 'Ερμῆς πρὸς τῆι πολίδι shows that he must be distinguished from the far older 'Ερμῆς Ἀγοραῖος <sup>1)</sup>. A building of walls mentioned in the fifth book can only refer to the activity of Konon, which indeed was sufficiently important to justify a dedication by the college of 5 archons in 395/4 B.C. <sup>2)</sup>. It is inexplicable that modern writers again and again connect this fragment with the building of the wall by Themistokles <sup>3)</sup>. Also the consecration by the entire college and the imitation of the epigram of Simonides in an official poem are more in accord with a later date. But the decisive fact is the number of the book, and we need 10 not regret that the names following the epigram (it says οἷδε) are lacking: Ph. himself may have omitted them if he gave in the heading the complete list of the officials of the year. The accounts <sup>4)</sup> show that building already began in 395/4 B.C., *i.e.* before the naval battle at Knidos <sup>5)</sup>, and it is naturally connected with the preparations for the Corinthian War. The accounts 15 mention *τειχοποιοὶ αἰρεθέντες* from the several *phylai* <sup>6)</sup>; Ph. evidently recorded this, but we cannot restore what he said <sup>7)</sup>, as Harpokration (as usual) abbreviates the text: at any rate, *τοῦτον* pointing to the lemma has supplanted a *'Ερμῆν*. If the alteration *ἀστικόν* is correct (and *'Αττικόν* is impossible) the Hermes stood at the principal gate in the north <sup>8)</sup>, 20 and building began here. In the year 394/3 B.C. the inscriptions record a section of the building *μέχρι τοῦ μετώπου τῶν πολῶν τῶν κατὰ τὸ Ἀφροδίσαιον*. The form of the excerpt does not in this case favour the suggestion of a digression by Ph. about the walls of the Peiraeus; but even if the subject was treated in a digression nothing would be altered as to the date.

25 (41) The year is that of the conclusion of the new Athenian naval confederation. There can be no serious doubt that the reform of taxation was planned in connexion with it. In view of the changes made in the time of Demosthenes <sup>1)</sup> it is particularly regrettable that we learn nothing from the fragment but the bare fact <sup>2)</sup>. About the leading 30 politicians of that time see Hommel *Heliaia*, 1927, p. 132 ff.

(42-44) Apparently these three fragments belong to the same context of the war <sup>1)</sup> on the Thracian-Macedonian coast where from 368/7 B.C. Iphikrates operated against Amphipolis. He was relieved by Timotheos in 364/3 B.C. The fragments must all be dated after this year.

35 (42) The subject *Μιλτοκύθης* is provided by the quotation from Theopompos about his death, the date by Demosthenes' *Aristocratea* <sup>1)</sup> and Ps. Demosthenes' speech against Polykles <sup>2)</sup>. Accordingly his defection from Kotys must fall in the Attic year 363/2 or (rather) 362/1 B.C. It is not likely that a statement of some other 'author concerning Miltokythes' his-

tory generally' preceded<sup>3</sup>): the lexicographer first furnishes evidence for the single facts mentioned by Demosthenes in his *Aristocratea* and concludes with references to the comprehensive accounts of ἄλλοι τε καὶ Ἀναξιμένης<sup>4</sup>). It is conceivable that this author was a source of Ph., too, but he may have found the facts more conveniently under the years of the archons as recorded by Androtion<sup>5</sup>).

(43) In the same speech against Polykles<sup>1</sup>) the speaker, who was among the trierarchs of 362/1 B.C., tells about the service he had to perform because his successor did not arrive: at the order of the strategos Timomachos, whom ambassadors from Maroneia had asked to help them, he and others escorted corn-ships from Sestos to Maroneia; later on he brought from Thasos μετὰ τῶν Θασίων εἰς τὴν Στρώμην σῆτον καὶ πελταστάς, ὡς παραληψόμενος αὐτὸς τὸ χωρίον, where the Maronites ὑπὲρ τοῦ χωρίου τούτου offered a naval battle. This happened ὑπ' αὐτὰς Πλειάδων<sup>2</sup>) δυσμάς. The conflict between Thasos and Maroneia continued<sup>3</sup>); but if Ph. treated its causes in a digression he probably did so on the occasion of the first mention of the conflict in 361/0 B.C. Probably he added the digression with the quotation from Archilochos to the facts taken from Androtion. Whether he composed it from his own reading or used a local chronicle<sup>4</sup>) can hardly be decided. But the suggestion of Hiller von Gaertringen<sup>5</sup>) is quite incredible that Ph. is meant by τοῦ ἀνηγαγώχτος ταῦτα εἰς [τοὺς ἄρχοντας] in the Archilochos monument of Paros (502 F I col. I 5/6).

(44) Diodor. 16, 3, 7 (360/59 B.C.) ἅμα δὲ τούτοις πραττομένοις (Philip's victory over Argaios and the Athenians) Θάσιοι μὲν ὠικισαν τὰς ὀνομαζόμενας Κρηνίδας, ἃς ὕστερον ὁ βασιλεὺς ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ ὀνομάσας Φιλίππου ἐπλήρωσεν οἰκητόρων; 16, 8, 6 (358/7 B.C.; correctly 357/6) after the conquest of Amphipolis, Pydna, Poteidaia<sup>1</sup>) παρελθὼν ἐπὶ πόλιν Κρηνίδας ταύτην μὲν ἐπαυξήσας οἰκητόρων πλήθει μετωνόμασε Φιλίππου ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ<sup>2</sup>) προσαγορεύσας, τὰ δὲ κατὰ τὴν πόλιν (PX χώραν γ) χρύσεια μέταλλα παντελῶς ἔντα λιτὰ καὶ ἄδοξα ταῖς κατασκευαῖς ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἠξήσῃεν ὥστε δύνασθαι φέρειν αὐτῶι πρόσδοον πλεῖον ἢ χιλιῶν ταλάντων κτλ. The article of the lexicon, which is drastically cut down, does not allow us to recognize whether Ph. recorded the re-naming of Daton-Krenides on the occasion of its conquest by Philip in 357/6 B.C.<sup>3</sup>), or anticipating when the Thasians founded the place in 361/0 (360/59) B.C., or twice (as the authority of Diodoros did<sup>4</sup>)). But there is no doubt that he entered the foundation<sup>5</sup>). Nor can we recognize whether Ph. called the town, which the Thasians founded and which Philip conquered, Daton or Krenides. It should, however, be

noticed that the quotation does not simply say Δάτον, but ἡ πόλις τῶν Δατηγῶν <sup>5</sup>), a fact which points to some discussion of the question of the name, if only a brief one. Since Heuzey it is generally assumed that Daton was the name both of a region and of a town <sup>6</sup>), and the assumption 5 is certainly correct. But the inference from a passage of Appian <sup>7</sup>) that the Thasians founded Daton on the site of the former Krenides, is contradicted by the number and the weight of the witnesses who call the town conquered by Philip Krenides: καὶ Κρηνίδας συνεξαίρη[σω καὶ Κετριπ]όριος καὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν in the oath of 356/5 B.C. <sup>8</sup>); the historical 10 source of Diodoros, and the geographers <sup>9</sup>). Certainly the old, the new, and the latest name occurred in Ph., and the analogy of F 43 makes it appear probable that he went into the previous history of the place when he first mentioned it. As to the division of the books of the *Atthis* we gain from F 44 nothing but the fact that the fifth book certainly extended at 15 least to 360/59 B.C.

(45-46) Ph. had entered the introduction of symmories for the taxation of property of the πλούσιοι καὶ εἰσφέρειν τῇ πόλει δυνάμενοι in his fifth book under Nausinikos 378/7 B.C. <sup>1</sup>). If in his sixth book he discussed the 1200 πλουσιώτατοι, οἱ καὶ ἐλειτούργουν, he can only refer to the 20 trierarchic symmories, for 'the trierarchy is a liturgy, the property-tax is not' <sup>2</sup>). It is with these symmories that Demosthenes deals in his 14th speech, where he declares that the amount of the Attic τίμημα was 6000 talents <sup>3</sup>). Whatever τίμημα means—national property or 'rateable value' <sup>4</sup>)—these things belong together. I therefore prefer a slight alteration in 25 the number of the book (ἕκτῃ instead of δεκάτῃ) to the suggestions of Boeckh that 'the tenth book contained supplements particularly of the fifth' <sup>5</sup>), or alternatively that Ph. had in his tenth book, on an occasion no longer recognizable to us, inserted a retrospective digression <sup>6</sup>) on the development of Athenian national wealth. We cannot decide whether 30 Ph. stated the amount when dealing with the introduction of the trierarchic symmories by the law of Periandros in 357/6 B.C. (358/7) <sup>7</sup>) or on the occasion of Demosthenes' motions for alterations in 354/3 B.C. <sup>8</sup>).

(47-48) According to the context in which the orator mentions the capture of the Paralos (F 47) <sup>1</sup>) these events evidently happened not very 35 long before. To date them absolutely will not be possible until the date of the first Philippic is agreed upon; at present the Attic year 352/1 B.C. remains the most probable one. The decree quoted in F 48 to commission two new 'sacred' triremes (the restitution of Ph. for Stesichoros is certainly correct) belongs to the same year 307/6 in which the phylai Anti-

gonis and Demetrias were established <sup>2</sup>); it was the natural consequence of Stratokles' motion *ὅπως οἱ πεμπόμενοι κατὰ ψήφισμα δημοσίαι πρὸς Ἀντίγονον ἢ Δημήτριον ἀντὶ πρεσβευτῶν θεωροὶ λέγοντο* <sup>3</sup>). Both fragments are quoted from the sixth book and an alteration of  $\bar{F}$  to  $\bar{H}$  <sup>4</sup>) is not probable. We therefore conclude: (1) that Ph. either when recording the capture of the Paralos, or (perhaps more likely) when dealing with the administration of Lykurgos <sup>5</sup>) summarily discussed the *ἱερὰ τρίηρεις* by anticipation and retrospectively; (2) that this book was not written until after 307/6 B.C. <sup>6</sup>). About the length and the contents of that digression nothing can be stated definitely. Ph. probably also gave the derivation of the name of the Paralos (which the historians mention particularly often) from the hero who was believed to be the inventor of warships <sup>7</sup>), and he certainly recorded when and why the Salaminia was replaced by the Ammonias. This probably happened during the administration of Lykurgos <sup>8</sup>), which abounded in religious innovations, and the reason for the re-naming may simply be that a 'sacred' name was wanted for the second trireme <sup>9</sup>). The sixth book may very well have contained that reform <sup>10</sup>), and in view of the wording of F 48 it is perhaps more likely that the digression occurred here than at the end of the fifties.

<sup>20</sup> (49-51) Dionys. Hal. *Ad. Attm.* 4 ἐπὶ δὲ Καλλιμάχου (349/8 B.C.) . . . τρεῖς διέθετο δημηγορικούς <λόγους> παρακαλῶν Ἀθηναίους βοήθειαν Ὀλυνθίους ἀποστεῖλαι τοῖς πολεμουμένοις ὑπὸ Φιλίππου. *Ibid.* 10 μετὰ γὰρ ἄρχοντα Καλλιμάχον, ἐφ' οὗ τὰς εἰς Ὀλυθον βοηθείας ἀπέστειλαν Ἀθηναῖοι, πεισθέντες ὑπὸ Δημοσθένους, Θεόφιλος ἐστὶν ἄρχων (348/7 B.C.), καθ' ὃν ἐκράτησε τῆς Ὀλυθίων πό-  
<sup>25</sup> λεως Φίλιππος. *Vii. X or.* p. 845 DE Καλλιμάχον, ἐφ' οὗ πρὸς Ὀλυθίων ἦκε πρεσβεία περὶ τῆς βοηθείας, ἐπεὶ ἐπιέζοντο ὑπὸ Φιλίππου τῶι πολέμωι, ἐπεισεν ἐκπέμψαι τὴν βοήθειαν τῶι δ' ἕξῃς.... Φίλιππος Ὀλυθίους κατεστρέψατο. *Diodoros* 16, 53/4 wrongly crowds all these events into the year 348/7 B.C. In spite of the gap F 49 makes it certain that the alliance was not made until  
<sup>30</sup> 349/8 B.C. and became effectual at once. It must therefore be separated from the conclusion of peace between Athens and Olynthos, which we are not able to date accurately <sup>1</sup>). Dionysios has excerpted from Ph. only what he needed for dating Demosthenes' Olynthian speeches: they are accurate statements, as succinct as the style of a chronicle  
<sup>35</sup> requires <sup>2</sup>), purely matter of fact and recorded in chronological sequence <sup>3</sup>), about the three expeditionary forces sent probably in consequence of motions put forward by Demosthenes. In the *Atthis* these statements were probably interrupted by entries in the same style concerning other events of the same year 349/8 <sup>4</sup>). In F 49; 51 Ph. calls the claimants for

help 'Ολύθιοι, in F 50 Χαλκιδεῖς οἱ ἐπὶ Θράκιης; the two are obviously identical, for Charidemos <sup>5</sup>) devastated Pallene and Bottiaia μετ' 'Ολυθίων. Either name may have occurred repeatedly in books IV-V; the alternating use is merely interesting because it shows that Ph., who was well acquainted with documents, makes use of the official Athenian designation of the Olynthian state in one instance. The evidence, frequently misinterpreted though it is, can in my opinion have but one meaning: the state is called almost without exception 'Ολυθος and οἱ 'Ολύθιοι by the authors of the fourth century B.C. (and probably in every-day language too) <sup>6</sup>); in the Athenian state inscriptions the official name is Χαλκιδεῖς οἱ ἐπὶ Θράκιης <sup>7</sup>), whereas the Chalcidians call themselves officially Χαλκιδεῖς for obvious reasons <sup>8</sup>). The question much discussed recently whether these 'Ολύθιοι-Χαλκιδεῖς were a 'unitary state' or a 'federal state' seems to be decided in favour of the latter alternative by the usage of language <sup>9</sup>). F 49-51 do not, however, add to our knowledge about the foundation and the development of the League; the fourth book might have helped here.

(52) See (on F 119 and) on Androtion 324 F 52.

(53-56) Foucart's <sup>1</sup>) reasons against Diels' assumption <sup>2</sup>) of Didymos and Dionysios being dependent on Hermippos' biography of Demosthenes are not decisive, but he is right as to the matter. It is a certain fact that Didymos consulted the more important Atthidographers, and Dionysios may be trusted to have read one or two books (he did not need more) of Ph. On the other hand it is very uncertain whether Hermippos gave long quotations from Ph. Both Didymos and Dionysios deal with the chronology of Demosthenes' speeches in their relation to the history of that time; both determine it mainly by the help of Ph.'s *Atthis*; but Dionysios also quotes κοινὰ ἱστορία for the period 347/6-341/0 B.C., and the dates of the archons show that this means his ordinary chronological handbook, not a historical work. Their purpose is altogether different: Dionysios intends to refute the assertion τὰς 'Αριστοτέλους ἐξωληθέναι τέχνας τὸν Δημοσθένη by proving that Demosthenes' great political speeches were given πρὸ τῆς ἐκδόσεως τῶν 'Αριστοτέλους τεχνῶν; he is therefore merely concerned with the dates of the speeches. Didymos, on the other hand, writes a running commentary on the facts mentioned in the speeches, and he discusses the date and the genuineness of the speeches occasionally in the notes on individual passages <sup>3</sup>). That is why Dionysios provides us with a continuous excerpt from the *Atthis*, whereas Didymos excerpts pieces of it in several notes on *or.* 9 and 11. Decisive

is F 56, where Diels supplemented too much at the end of b <sup>4</sup>): in F 56b, which is a note on *or.* II, 4 ὑποπτεύεται δὲ ὑπὸ Θεβαίων Νίκαιαν μὲν φρουραῖ κατέχων, Didymos determines the topographical position of Nikaia using Timosthenes *Περὶ λιμένων*, the historical part it played at that time using Ph.; a concluding remark states that there are homonymous towns *περὶ ὧν οὐκ οἶμαι ἀναγκαῖον νῦν λέγειν*—the whole passage a typical 'page of notes' containing everything Didymos had collected about Nikaia from quite different sources. F 56a is a simple excerpt from Ph.; like F 54/5 it serves to establish the dates of Demosthenes' activity during the last war with Philip (340-338 B.C.). Therefore that very detail is lacking which Didymos had noted on his slip about Nikaia: Dionysios deliberately omitted the words *καὶ ἀξιούντος - πέμψειν*, they have not dropped out in the tradition, for he excerpts only *τὰ ἀναγκαιότατα*, and details like that are unimportant for his purpose. All these facts are quite plain. The real difficulty of F 56a consists in its being only apparently verbatim and only apparently continuous. What is evidently verbatim is the resolution of the people *τὰ μὲν ἔργα - γράψαντος* <sup>5</sup>). If *ἐπὶ τούτου* is from Ph. (I do not confidently assert that it is) the resolution was carried in the beginning of Lysimachides' year <sup>6</sup>).

The sentence *Φιλίππου - Φθιωτῶν* can hardly have followed this passage immediately in Ph.: he must certainly have mentioned Philip's election as strategos of the Amphictyony at the Pylaia in autumn 339 B.C. <sup>7</sup>), in consequence of which he set out at once <sup>8</sup>) and occupied Kytinion and Elateia immediately; then the diplomatic interlude begins; Dionysios ought to have marked the gap by an *ἔπειτα διεξελθῶν* <sup>9</sup>). But from now on the excerpt becomes quite careless: the sentence *Φιλίππου - Φθιωτῶν* about the embassy of the five peoples may in itself be excerpted verbatim, and the note of Didymos actually proves it to be so. But subsequently Dionysios cuts out everything (again the text of Didymos shows this), not only the request to deliver up Nikaia, and with a few words of his own he sums up all that happened between the first embassy from the part of Philip <sup>10</sup>) and the embassy of the Athenians whose leader was Demosthenes. He ought at least to have copied what happened in Athens in consequence of the information about the capture of Elateia; Ph. certainly recorded this, and it would have been much more essential for Dionysios' own purpose than the report about the composition of the first embassy. But he is merely interested in the fact that Demosthenes went to Thebes, as before and in F 55 he is merely interested in the motions Demosthenes carried. There were no speeches of the orator in the period

in question or for a while after it: had there been such, Dionysios might have determined their date by further quotations from the historical source. But the excerpt is cut so short as to be even grammatically obscure <sup>11</sup>). It is quite wrong to believe that one could obtain the text of Ph. by inserting F 56b into F 56a or, inversely, by extending F 56b through the addition of the concluding words of F 56a: 'Αθηναίων - ἐψηφίσαντο is not in the style of a chronicle nor in that of Ph. <sup>12</sup>).

(53) This fragment is the introduction not only to F 54 but to the whole group of excerpts F 54-56, for the war did not open until Philip's action in Phokis and the alliance between Thebes and Athens.

(54) If this is a verbatim excerpt the succinctness, which seems to contradict ἀκριβῶς in F 53, is surprising, as F 162 is evidence of Ph. having dealt in detail at least with the opening of the war, when Philip was standing at Byzantium with half his army. The possibility must after all be considered that Ph. actually did not enlarge on the attack on Perinthos because Athens did not intervene at that stage <sup>1</sup>). But it is doubtful whether the excerpt is verbatim: ἀναπλεύσας requires a complement <sup>2</sup>). It is therefore more likely that it is only a brief summary of what Dionysios found in the *Atthis* under the year 340/39 B.C. Anyhow, there is no doubt (τὸ μὲν πρῶτον) that Ph. dated the attack on Perinthos (which Diodoros reported under the year 341/0 B.C.) at the opening of the Athenian year 340/39 B.C. That may be wrong, because he possibly had no documentary dates from Athens for the siege, still I doubt the calculation of Beloch that it 'must have begun in spring 340' <sup>3</sup>).

(55) The speech of Demosthenes has not been preserved which means that he did not publish it. That is the reason why the *Corpus Demosthenicum* inserted in its stead the speech no. 11 Πρὸς τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τὴν Φιλίππου, and took the letter itself from the historical work of Anaximenes <sup>1</sup>). Ph. does not provide the words but the contents of the ψήφισμα by the passing of which the people voted the war <sup>2</sup>). Ναῦς πληροῦν is the technical term for the mobilization of the fleet; it is possible but not at all certain that a figure has dropped out: for at first 40 ships sailed under Chares <sup>3</sup>), subsequently another squadron under Phokion and Kephisophon <sup>4</sup>). The total number is given as 120 πλοῖα in the forged psephism of Byzantium (Demost. II. στέφ. 90), and this need not be wrong, as Chios, Kos, Rhodos, and other states also sent help <sup>5</sup>).

(56) The building of the σκευοθήκη of Philon was voted in 347/6 B.C. <sup>1</sup>) but completed by Lykurgos only in 330/29 (?) <sup>2</sup>). In *I G<sup>2</sup> II 505 = Syll.<sup>3</sup> 346* (302/1 B.C.) an Ilian and an Ephesian κατοικοῦντες Ἀθήνησι

are mentioned because they contributed εἰς τε τὴν οἰκοδομίαν τῶν νεωσοικῶν καὶ τῆς σκευοθήκης ἀπὸ Θεμιστοκλέους ἀρχοντος (347/6) μέχρι Κηφισοδώρου (323/2). Φιλίππου - Κυτίμιον] Aischin. 3, 140; Demosth. 18, 168<sup>3</sup>); Diodor. 16, 84, 2 under the year 338/7 (*sic*); Plutarch. *Demosth.* 18, 1. All these authors mention only Elateia. About Kytinion and its strategical importance see Kromayer *Antike Schlachtfelder* I p. 132; 146 n. 3. Foucart dates the capture of Elateia in October 339 B.C.; Beloch<sup>4</sup>) in November or December of that year. πέμψαντος - <πέμψειν>] We must take as a basis not the text which Dionysios seems to have drastically abridged, but the note about Nikaia as excerpted by Didymos<sup>5</sup>). The difficulty F 56 causes for the interpretation<sup>6</sup>) is the following: (1) Demosthenes who, in consequence of the news about the capture of Elateia, was sent to Thebes as an ambassador<sup>7</sup>) says (Π. στεφ. 211, referring to the ἐπιστολή ἦν τότε ἐπέμψαμεν εὐθύς οἱ πρέσβεις): 15 ὡς γὰρ ἀφικόμεθα εἰς τὰς Θήβας, καταλαμβάνομεν Φιλίππου καὶ Θετταλῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων συμμάχων παρόντας πρέσβεις; (2) the Macedonian historian Marsyas<sup>8</sup>), according to the account of Plutarch, related that Philip ἐπεμψε ἀντεροῦντας the Macedonians Amyntas and Klearchos and the Thessalians Daochos and Thrasydaios; (3) although Ph. says Φιλίππου 20 πέμψαντος πρέσβεις εἰς Θήβας καὶ ἀξιούντος he mentions ambassadors of the σύμμαχοι only. In view of the carelessness of Dionysios' excerpt one is disposed to add the ambassadors of Philip before τῶν Θετταλῶν, but they are lacking in Didymos too, and what the latter reports about this embassy in my opinion decidedly contradicts the possibility of identifying 25 it with the embassy mentioned by Demosthenes and Marsyas. The individual request that Thebes should surrender Nikaia would be inappropriate at a moment in which the vital decision is hanging in the balance whether Thebes will join Philip or Athens, and the Theban answer is impossible if this question was put. Τούτοις μὲν ἀπεκρίναντο 30 incontestable evidence that only that request was made, apparently not by Philip<sup>9</sup>), and that Thebes was trying to gain time by declaring that she would send πρεσβείαν ὑπὲρ πάντων πρὸς Φίλιππον διαλεξομένην. The δέ - sentence which Didymos did not excerpt because it did not concern Nikaia must have contained something about what the Thebans 35 further said or did. We cannot guess what it was<sup>10</sup>). But it seems clear that the embassy, now attested by Ph. only, was merely a preliminary skirmish between the σύμμαχοι of Philip and Thebes about one particular question, not about the decisive struggle between Philip and Athens for the soul of Thebes. It may have happened immediately after the autumn



Pylaia of 339 B.C., in which Philip had been elected strategos of the Amphictyony against Amphissa; at the latest when the king set out against Phokis. The course of events was precipitate: while the *σύμμαχοι* were putting their demand to Thebes to deliver up Nikaia and  
 5 the Thebans were answering evasively, the king captured Elateia. From Elateia he sent the embassy of four men which asked for the entry of the Boeotian league into an alliance with Macedonia <sup>11</sup>). That embassy possibly arrived in Thebes earlier, if only by a few hours, than Demosthenes and his fellow-ambassadors, and Marsyas may have  
 10 slightly shifted the sequence of events in order to lay the blame for the war on Athens <sup>12</sup>). We are by no means well informed about the details, and should not simplify too much, as the preserved records are inclined to do which concentrate on Demosthenes and the great battle of words in the Theban assembly. In fact, nine months elapsed between the capture  
 15 of Elateia, the simultaneous and subsequent negotiations, and the battle of Chaeronea. It is also certain <sup>13</sup>) that Philip during these months was trying to avoid by further diplomatic means the war against Boeotia and Athens; Theopompos even mentions an embassy to Athens in order to reach a peaceful settlement <sup>14</sup>).

20 (57) Ph. discussed the Chytroi in detail in his book *Περὶ ἑορτῶν*, which Harpokration quotes for them (F 84). The mention of *ἀγῶνες χύτρινοι* in the *Attis* refers to their (re-)introduction by Lykurgos: *Vit. X or.* p. 841 F εἰσήνεγκε δὲ καὶ νόμους, τὸν μὲν περὶ τῶν κωμωιδῶν ἀγῶνα τοῖς Χύτριοις ἐπιτελεῖν ἐφάμιλλον ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ <sup>1</sup>) καὶ τὸν νικήσαντα εἰς ἄστυ κατα-  
 25 λέγεσθαι πρότερον οὐκ ἐξόν, ἀναλαμβάνων τὸν ἀγῶνα ἐκλειποτά. The interpretation as agones 'not of the comic poets but of the actors' <sup>2</sup>) is only contradicted by the fact that the law inserted in Demosthenes' *Midiana*  
 10 (349/8 B.C.) does not know of any performances at the Anthesteria; but it is doubtful whether the law is genuine <sup>3</sup>). Lykurgos' law cannot be  
 30 dated accurately, but is probably later than the one about the cult vessels *IG<sup>2</sup> II 333* from the end of 335/4 B.C. and belongs to the second (or third) period of his administration. If this assumption is correct it would be important for the time treated in book VI <sup>4</sup>).

(58) Pollux 4, 123 μέρη δὲ θεάτρου · πυλῖς καὶ ψαλῖς καὶ κατατομή, κερκί-  
 35 δες, σκηνή, ὄρχήστρα, λογεῖον κτλ. *Lex. rhet.* p. 270, 21 Bkr (Phot. s.v.)  
 κατατομή · ἡ ὄρχήστρα ἡ νῦν στίγμα λεγομένη · ἡ μέρος τι τοῦ θεάτρου  
 κατετιμήθη, ἐπεὶ ἐν ὄρει κατεσκευάσται · ἡ κατὰ συμβεβηκὸς ὁ τόπος οὗτω  
 καλεῖται · ἡ τὸ νῦν λεγόμενον διάζωμα. 'Eine für die anlage des oberen  
 zuschauerraums senkrecht abgearbeitete wand des burgfelsens' Judeich

*Topogr.*<sup>3</sup> p. 315; 'this, in all probability, was the vertical face of rock which rises above the rim of the auditorium and in which the monument of Thrasyllus was set' Kourouniotes-Thompson *Hesperia* I, 1932, p. 137<sup>1</sup>). If Pausan. I, 21, 3—*ἐν δὲ τῇ κορυφῇ τοῦ θεάτρου σπήλαιόν ἐστιν ἐν 5 ταῖς πέτραις ὑπὸ τῇ ἀκρόπολιν· τρίπους δὲ ἔπεστι καὶ τούτῳ· Ἀπόλλων δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ Ἄρτεμις τοὺς παῖδας εἰς ἀναιροῦντες τοὺς Νιόβης*—means the votive gift of Aischraios<sup>2</sup>), *κατατομή* cannot be the same as *διάζωμα*<sup>3</sup>), if only because the Athenian theatre had several of the latter. Aischraios is known from naval documents in the years 337/6 to 325/4 10 B.C. (?)<sup>4</sup>). *Τῷ πρότερον ἔτει* may refer to the fact that he put up his tripod on the occasion of the completion of the new theatre. That would be more plausible than to connect the note by a *δπου* with a description of the Assembly in the Harpalos affair, analogous to that of Hypereides<sup>5</sup>).

(59) Col. II seems to belong to a general concluding section 'dealing 15 with Plato and his importance'<sup>1</sup>); in its lower part (v. 35 ff.) the death of Plato is mentioned; it also contains a note of Neanthes<sup>2</sup>), surprising in this place, about Plato's name; but in between 16 lines are completely lost. It is not at all certain that a new reading of v. 1-19, which Croenert demands, will yield much. As to the badly damaged context it is certain: 20 (1) that a portrait of Isokrates was mentioned; (2) that Ph.'s sixth book was quoted; (3) that the biographer corrected Ph. on the basis of a statement by Dikaiarchos<sup>3</sup>). The following points remain doubtful: (1) what the alleged error of Ph. was, for of v. 7-11 we have only remains of letters that cannot be interpreted; (2) whether the note concerning the setting 25 up of a portrait of Isokrates still belongs to the context of v. 4-10 (?), and whether Ph. is its author. Generally speaking it seems possible that in v. 12 another verbatim quotation of Ph. began with *καὶ ἀνέθεσαν κτλ.*<sup>4</sup>); but the supplement *ἐν τῷ πέμπτῳ* lacks probability. The artist Butes (?) is otherwise unknown, and it is not at all certain that -*υς* is 30 the remains of a demotikon. Foucart's assertion<sup>5</sup>)—'la forme de la signature indique les premières années du IV<sup>me</sup> siècle, après lesquelles l'usage disparaît de rejeter le démotique du sculpteur après le verbe *ἐποίησε*'—even if it is correct does not help. There is indeed much talk about a 'contemporary' portrait of Sokrates<sup>6</sup>) at present, but the papyrus 35 does say *Ἰσοκράτους*, and the corruption not unfrequent in itself of *Σωκράτους* to *Ἰσοκράτους* (it would have to be something of the kind) is not exactly credible in a Life of Plato<sup>7</sup>). If the note is from Ph. and if it is taken from the sixth book (two big ifs)<sup>8</sup>), the death of Isokrates, shortly after the battle of Chaeronea, might be considered.

Nor does it appear impossible that Ph. discussed the relations between Plato and Isokrates, or those of both schools to Macedonia. But there is not enough left for making any of these suggestions probable <sup>9)</sup>.

(60) [Demosth.] 25, 79-80 οὐτός—τά μὲν ἄλλα σιωπῶ, ἀλλ' ἐφ' οἷς ἡμεῖς 5 τὴν μιανὴν Θεωρίδα, τὴν Λημνίαν, τὴν φαρμακίδα, καὶ αὐτὴν καὶ τὸ γένος ἅπαν ἀπεκτείνετε, ταῦτα λαβὼν τὰ φάρμακα καὶ τὰς ἐπωιδὰς παρὰ τῆς θεραπαίνης αὐτῆς, ἣ κατ' ἐκείνης τότε ἐμήνυσεν, ἐξ ἧσπερ ὁ βάσκανος οὗτος πεπαιδοποιήται, μαγγανεύει καὶ φανακίζει καὶ τοὺς ἐπιλήπτους φησὶν ἰᾶσθαι. Plutarch. *Demosth.* 14, 6 κατηγορήσε (scil. Δημοσθένης) καὶ τῆς ἱερείας Θεωρίδος ὡς ἄλλα τε 10 ραιδιουργούσης πολλὰ καὶ τοὺς δούλους ἐξαπατᾶν διδασκούσης· καὶ θανάτου τιμωσάμενος ἀπέκτεινε.

We cannot ascribe to Ph. with certainty more than the words Θεωρίς ἀσεβείας κριθεῖσα ἀπέθανεν, and the *Atthis* may have contained only this brief entry and the name of the accuser. One may doubt whether the mantis Ph. called the woman μάντις, even 15 'in dem herabsetzenden sinne von winkelprophet' <sup>1)</sup>. She may have been priestess (ἱερεία Plut.) of some alien cult. Plutarch's source is not known. It remains uncertain whether Demosthenes actually was the prosecutor, and whether Ph. mentioned that also.

(61) Schol. Soph. *O. C.* 1600 Εὐχλόου Δημήτρος <sup>1)</sup> ἱερόν ἐστι πρὸς τῆι 20 ἀκροπόλει· καὶ <sup>2)</sup> Εὐπολις Μαριχαῖ (I 309, 183 K) »ἀλλ' εἰθὺ πόλεως εἰμι· θύσαι γάρ με δεῖ / κριὸν Χλόηι Δημήτρι», ἐνθα δηλοῦται ὅτι ἴκαί κριὸς θήλεια <sup>3)</sup> τῆι θεῶι ταύτῃ θύεται. οὕτω δὲ τιμᾶται ἀπὸ <sup>4)</sup> τῆς κατὰ τῶν κήπων γλόης, θύουσι <sup>5)</sup> τε Θαρρηλιῶνος ἔκτι. The cultic facts in this passage are apparently 25 taken from Ph., for Didymos probably used him for his commentaries on Eupolis as well as for those on Aristophanes and Sophokles. It is also possible that Ph. discussed the sacrifice of male animals to female gods, though one rather expects that in *Περὶ ἑορτῶν* or in *Περὶ θυσῶν*. Therefore v. Prott's supplement <ταῦτα Φιλόχορος φησὶν ἐν ζ> ἐνθα is improbable. If anything has to be altered in the scholion, cut down and badly pre- 30 served at it is, it is Θαρρηλιῶνος, ὡς Φιλόχορος ἔκτι. In the scholion on Aristophanes (because of ἐν and the position of the quotation) ζ can only refer to the number of the book of the *Atthis*, not to the date of the sacrifice to Demeter Chloe. If the two notes are to be brought into accord, the supplement Θαρρηλιῶνος <ζ>, ὡς Φ. φησὶν ἐν ζ would be simpler than 35 Mommsen's <sup>6)</sup> Θαρρηλιῶνος, ὡς Φ. φ., τῆι ἔκτι. There is no other evidence as to the day of the sacrifice on the Acropolis <sup>7)</sup>.

(62) Phyle may have occurred anywhere and often; there is no reason for thinking precisely of its occupation by Thrasymbulos (F 143) and therefore altering the number of the book. Ph. is quoted only for calling the

place a φρούριον <sup>1)</sup>, not for its belonging to the Oeneis. Consequently the new fact that a part of Phyle was added to the Demetrias in 306 B.C. <sup>2)</sup> does not furnish a *terminus ante* for the fragment.

(63-65) None of the quotations from the seventh book is datable, for we can assign none of them to a definite historic event. But Boeckh's view (founded on the descriptive imperfect in F 64/5) that F 63/5 belong to a systematic description of the Athenian state at a past epoch is very credible. As the administration of Lykurgos had already been treated in the sixth book the most likely suggestion would be the administration of Demetrios of Phaleron, who πολλὰ καὶ κάλλιστα τῇ πατρίδι ἐπολιτεύσατο <sup>1)</sup>. The fact that both the ἀποστολεῖς and the νομοφύλακες are demonstrably earlier does not absolutely contradict. More important is what results from F 64: Ph. discussed the several officials in detail, entering into their previous history and their development. That makes for a voluminous digression, probably filling the greater part of the seventh book, which we should like to be able to compare with Aristotle's 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία. A difference in the arrangement was necessary if only because of Ph.'s historical context, which precluded the Aristotelian division into a historical and a systematic part: Ph.'s description must have been wholly systematic though he probably furnished more historical material and above all more dates than Aristotle did. We should be glad to know how far Demetrios' five books Περὶ τῆς 'Αθήνησιν νομοθεσίας <sup>2)</sup> supplied the material for this particular digression; whether Ph. made use of the two books Περὶ τῶν 'Αθήνησιν πολιτειῶν and of the autobiographic works Περὶ τῆν δεκαετίας and Ὑπὲρ τῆς πολιτείας; and above all how he judged the activity of Demetrios personally which he witnessed αἰσθανόμενος τῇ ἡλικίαι. One would think *a priori* that he sympathized with its purpose. In any case, he appreciated the historical importance of Demetrios, for he began the second and more voluminous part of his *Atthis*, the contemporary history, with the seventh book <sup>3)</sup>.

(63) Lex. rhet. p. 203, 22 = Synag. Lex. p. 435, 29 Bkr ἀποστολεῖς· δέκα τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἄρχοντες ἦσαν, οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκπομπῆς τῶν ἐκπλεουσῶν (πλευουσῶν S) τριήρων καὶ τῶν ἱάποστόλων ἀναγομένων (ἀναγομένων στόλων S) ἀποδειγμένοι· ἀποστολεῖς δὲ παρὰ τὸ ἀποστέλλειν τὰ πλοῖα. Pollux 8, 99 ἀποστολεῖς οἱ προνοούμενοι τῶν ἀποστόλων (v.l. τοῦ ἀποστόλου) καὶ τοῦ ἐκπλου τῶν τριήρων. Hesych. s.v. ἀποστολεύς· τὰ πρὸς πλοῦν παρασκευάζων τοῖς πλεύουσιν <καὶ> ἀποστελλομένοις. Schol. Aischin. 2, 177 ἀποστολεῖς δὲ οἱ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων, ὥστε ἐκπεμφθῆναι τοὺς πλέοντας στρατιώτας· περὶ τῶν ἀποστολέων ἐγνωμεν ἐν τῷ Ὑπὲρ τοῦ στεφάνου, ὅτι ἀρχὴ ἦν ἐπὶ τὸ ἐπέιγειν τὸν στόλον ταχέ-

ως εκπλεῖσαι τεταγμένη. Only the mention of the number of ten goes beyond what we find in Demosth. 4, 35; 18, 80; 107; Aischin. 2, 177, and that may be taken from Ph. Otherwise, neither the Scholiasts nor the Lexicographers did utilize him, or rather his exposition has been mercilessly cut down. Even the orators would have yielded more about the official functions of the ἀποστολαίς<sup>1)</sup>, and a decree from the year 325/4 B.C. shows that the office was not permanent but an extraordinary one<sup>2)</sup>, elected in case of a general or partial mobilization. If F 63 belongs to Ph.'s description of the political system of Demetrios of Phaleron we may infer that the custom was continued; there is no evidence but for the time of Demosthenes<sup>3)</sup>.

(64) Pollux 8, 94 νομοφύλακες ἐστεφάνωνται μὲν στοργίαι λευκῶν, τὴν δὲ πομπὴν πέμπουσι τῆς θεῶν, τοῖς δὲ προέδροις ἐν ἐκκλησίαις συγκαθίζουσιν, διακωλύοντες ἐπιχειροτονεῖν ὅσα μὴ συμφέρα. Lex. rhet. p. 283, 16 Bkr (abbreviated Lex. ὄν. p. 191, 21) νομοφύλακες· ἄρχοντες οἱ ἐν ἐκκλησίαις καὶ ἐν βουλῇ μετὰ τῶν προέδρων καθήμενοι, καὶ ἀναγκάζοντες αὐτοὺς τοῖς νόμοις χρῆσθαι, καὶ κωλύοντες ἐπιψηφίζεω, εἴ τι εἴη παράνομον ἢ ἀσίμφορον τῆ πόλει. — Pollux 8, 102 (Schol. Plat. Phaidon 59 E) οἱ ἑνδεκα· εἰς ἑκάστης φυλῆς ἐγίνετο, καὶ γραμματεῖς αὐτοῖς συνηριμαίτο, νομοφύλακες δὲ κατὰ τὸν Φαληρέα Δημήτριον μετωνομάσθησαν . . .<sup>1)</sup> τοῦ δὲ δεσμοφυλακίου (Schol. νομοφυλακίου Pollux) θύρα μία Χαρών(ε)μον ἐκαλεῖτο, δι' ἧς τὴν ἐπίθλασται ἐπιγόντο. Schol. V Aristoph. Vesp. 1108 παρὰ τοῖς ἑνδεκα· ἐτήρουν οἵδε τοὺς δεδεμένους· οὗτοι δὲ νῦν θεσμοφύλακες (δεσμιο-?) καλοῦνται.

Ph.'s treatment of the νομοφύλακες, which Harpokration asserts to have been detailed and which, because of that, his epitomator cut down, is preserved in the two excerpts of the Lex. Vindob. and the Synagoge (Phot. Sud.). The former cites Ph. at the opening and at the end; the latter (as usual, omitted the quotation like Pollux and the Lexeis which are of no particular importance. The Synagoge has cut off the concluding sentence of the original excerpt<sup>2)</sup>, but its systematic part contains passages of verbatim quotation but in no way complete, being presumably much altered<sup>3)</sup> nevertheless it affords valuable evidence as to Ph.'s manner of treating the municipal offices in his Politics. The two extracts differ a little from each other (contrary to the expectation) with the usual variations; and the latter is a copy of the original with the usual variations. It is the original preserved in a Phalanx manuscript of the 15th century, and is a copy of the original with the usual variations. It is the original preserved in a Phalanx manuscript of the 15th century, and is a copy of the original with the usual variations. It is the original preserved in a Phalanx manuscript of the 15th century, and is a copy of the original with the usual variations.

year, and this proceeding leaves no doubt of the fact that the systematic account refers to the year indicated <sup>5</sup>). The systematic part was perhaps divided into two sections: an introductory one about the name, the official dress, and the honorary privileges of the nomophylakes (στρόφια - ἑκαθέ-  
 5 ζοντο <sup>6</sup>), and a main section about their functions. This latter seems again to be divided according to the religious (καὶ τὴν πομπήν - θάλασσαν) and the political tasks (ἡνάγκαζον - πόλει), from which they drew their name <sup>7</sup>). That is the essential fact, and it is naturally placed at the end; it is as natural that the historical retrospective survey about their office  
 10 follows.

It is merely the historical part of this excellent report which provides difficulties. The state of the tradition is this: (1) The evidence of Ph. is formal that the nomophylakes were established when Ephialtes in 462/I B.C. deprived the Areopagos of all its rights with the excep-  
 15 tion of blood-justice, and it would not be easy to understand that the date could be either invented or due to an error <sup>8</sup>). (2) The succinct entry <sup>9</sup>) in Aristotle's 'Ath. 25, 2—ἔπειτα τῆς βουλῆς ἐπὶ Κόνωνος ἀρχοντος (462/I B.C.) ἅπαντα περιεῖλε (*scil.* Ephialtes) τὰ ἐπιθέτα δι' ὧν ἦν ἡ τῆς πολιτείας φυλακή, καὶ τὰ μὲν τοῖς πεντακοσίοις, τὰ δὲ τῶι δήμῳ καὶ  
 20 τοῖς δικαστηρίοις ἀπέδωκεν—is not sufficient for stating a factual contradiction between Aristotle and Ph., if we take the character of the former's book into account. (3) It must be admitted that Ph. is the only positive witness for nomophylakes in the fifth century. Anon. Argent. 19 ff.—  
 25 ἐπι οἱ θεσ[μοθέτ]αι / \* \* διὰ τὸ δίκαε ἐ[πι]δεταγμέν[ας (*sic*) . . . . / \* \* εἰσά]γειν αὐτο[ι]. μ[ε]τέβαινον δ[ε] ο[ . . . . ]ν / \* \* [εἰς τὸν] "Ἀρειον πάρο[ν]. τ[οῖς] (?) δὲ ξ̄ θεμέ[νοισ] / \* \* ]πρὸς δν αἱ χρ[ο]νογραφίαι . . . . [ . . ? / \* \* ]. αρχος . . νομοφύλακων ἀρχ. / \* \* ἀν]δρῶν τᾶ <sup>10</sup>)—is so badly preserved that we cannot restore the text with any certainty, even if  
 30 we compare the lexicographers quoted above p. 337, 12 ff. with their confusion of νομοφύλακες and θεσμοθέται and the alleged re-naming of the ἔνδεκα as νομοφύλακες. But the fact that we have no support for the information given by Ph. is as insufficient for discrediting it as is the silence of Aristotle <sup>11</sup>). (4) In the fourth century νομοφύλακες do not occur in the orators, although there are passages where we should  
 35 certainly expect them if they existed, or if they had the rights ascribed to them by Ph. <sup>12</sup>). (5) Aristotle (see no. 1) does not know about them in Athens <sup>13</sup>). (6) We meet them (again) for the first time in the speeches of Deinarchos quoted by Harpokration, which were both delivered at the end of the twenties <sup>14</sup>).

The following inferences from this state of the tradition appear to be certain: (1) The νομοφύλακες were not an institution of Demetrios of Phaleron; they probably belong to the later years of the period of restoration after the battle of Chaeronea <sup>15</sup>). (2) They did not exist, or 5 they were without importance, at the time of Demosthenes <sup>16</sup>). If we adhere to the formal evidence of Ph. about their first establishment in 462/1 B.C.—which we are obliged to do so long as its incorrectness is not proved or made probable <sup>17</sup>)—it further results (3) that the reformatory movement of the 'twenties did not create the nomophylakia for 10 the first time; it took up (or again made important) a fifth century office <sup>18</sup>). The old privileges of the Areopagos had been an object of discussion in conservative circles presumably since the overthrow of that board; their restitution was demanded with increasing energy since the attempts at a reform of the constitution made in and immediately after 15 the Decelean War <sup>19</sup>). The discussion was brought before a wider public by the two speeches which Isokrates published during the Social War, viz. the Ἀρεοπαγιτικός and Περὶ εἰρήνης; Androtion's *Atthis* and Aristotle's Ἀθπ. follow him and move in the same sphere of ideas <sup>20</sup>), and chronologically speaking they take us near the realization of the notion, even if 20 this realization took an unexpected form <sup>21</sup>). (4) That the development in the fifth century was not so simple as it appears in Aristotle's Ἀθπ. 25, 2. There is some evidence for the supposition that the repeal of what he calls τὰ ἐπίθετα δι' ὧν ἦν ἡ τῆς πολιτείας φυλακὴ did not happen all at once <sup>22</sup>). It is not only conceivable, it fits well into a development known 25 to us only in its rough outlines, but clearly tending toward the supreme domination of the Assembly, that the duty of nomophylakia was first transferred to a particular board, and that it was not until 462/1 (or even later) that this notion was conceived in its substance and defined as to its terminology. Probably this special board disappeared soon or lost its 30 importance. We know no particulars—and cannot expect to know any in view of the state of the tradition for the Pentekontaetia—about either the number of the νομοφύλακες <sup>23</sup>) established in 462/1 B.C., or the mode of their appointment <sup>24</sup>), or the date of their abolition <sup>25</sup>).

(65) Pollux 8, 112 γυναικονόμοι δὲ ἀρχὴ ἐπὶ τοῦ κόσμου τῶν γυναικῶν· 35 τὰς δὲ ἀκοσμοῦσας ἐζημίουν, καὶ τὰς ζημίας αὐτῶν γράφοντες ἐξετίθεσαν ἐπὶ τῆς πλατάνου τῆς ἐν Κεραμεικῶι <sup>1</sup>). Hesych. s.v. πλατάνος· δένδρον πρὸς δ' οἱ γυναικονόμοι τὰς ζημίας ἐν λευκώματι ἐξετίθεσαν. Harpokrat. (Suda) s.v. Ὅτι χιλίας ἐζημιούντο αἱ κατὰ τὰς ὁδοὺς ἀκοσμοῦσαι γυναῖκες Ὑπερείδης ἐν τῶι Κατ' Ἀρισταγόρας β̄ (F 14 Bl.-J.) εἶρηκεν· Κρωβύλος δὲ ὁ κωμικός φησι

(III 382, II K) τοῦ Φιλιππίδου τὸν νόμον εἶναι τὸν περὶ τούτων κείμενον.

There is no doubt of that particular board of officials. The amount of the fine is sufficient evidence of its not being created in order to proceed against prostitutes in the town and the Peiraeus harbour <sup>3</sup>). We are obviously dealing with an attempt at reforming morals by a legislation against luxury which concerns itself primarily (a frequent feature) with the conduct of women. Such a legislation practically affects only the well-to-do classes, the 'bourgeoisie'. What is meant by the term *ἀκοσμεῖν* is shown for instance by the psephism of Lykurgos <sup>4</sup>) and the measures ascribed to Solon <sup>4</sup>), which find some corroboration in the Axones but as a whole may have been formulated in these later times to serve as a precedent for the legislation of the restoration. The occurrence of Lykurgos in this context is particularly important because we cannot date the law of Philippides accurately <sup>4</sup>): the reforming movement here too began before the Dekaetia. The wide-spread assumption <sup>6</sup>) that the *γυναικονόμοι* at least were a creation of Demetrios of Phaleron can be neither refuted nor proved. Neither Harpokration nor the Lexeis have an article about them, and this is sufficient proof that the orators did not mention the board <sup>7</sup>). That it does not occur in the 'Αθπ. may provide (as in the case of the *νομοφύλακες* F 64) a *terminus post* for their establishment <sup>8</sup>); the quotation from Ph., however, and the two passages from the comic poets quoted by Athenaeus before it for the '*καινὸς νόμος*' <sup>9</sup>) are of no use for the dating. Ph. knows that the *γυναικονόμοι* and the Areopagos worked together: he is obviously describing a body of enactments against luxury, which may very well be part of the legislation of Demetrios whom Duris <sup>10</sup>) in his sharp attack on the regent's own luxurious life calls *ὁ τοῖς ἄλλοις τιθέμενος θεσμούς καὶ τοὺς βίους τάττων*. All these facts lead to the supposition that Demetrios created a comprehensive order of life in which the somewhat earlier regulations—the *γυναικονόμοι* of Philippides, the psephisma of Lykurgos, the *καινὸς νόμος* of which the comic poets speak, and others—found their place <sup>11</sup>).

(66) The two quotations F 66 and F 67 from books VIII and IX follow each other immediately in Dionysios. He excerpted them because, and as far as, they refer to the fate of the partisans of Demetrios of Phaleron whom he calls comprehensively and quite correctly *οἱ καταλύσαντες τὸν δῆμον* in the introductory words. Thus he obtained two fixed dates for Deinarchos for whom the biographical sources which he consulted <sup>1</sup>) did not give accurate particulars either as to his time or on other points <sup>2</sup>). For the orator belonged, at least according to his own assertion, among



those who fled from justice in 307/6 B.C. (the οὐχ ὑπομείναντες τὴν κρίσιν of Ph.), and who, for this reason alone, were condemned *in absentia* <sup>3</sup>). This fact, the particulars of Deinarchos' return to Athens, and apparently what he knew about his life in Athens before the Dekaeitia, Dionysios took from a largely autobiographical speech <sup>4</sup>), which (we must assume <sup>5</sup>) he was the first to use for that purpose, and he combined its statements with the dates he gained from Ph.s *Atthis* <sup>6</sup>). As the name of Deinarchos does not appear in the passage of F 66 where we expect in Ph. an enumeration of those who were released and those who were condemned (at least of the prominent men among them), and as Dionysios replaces the supposed enumeration by the summary πολλοὶ πολιτῶν, the inference seems inevitable that Ph. did not mention the name of Deinarchos at all <sup>7</sup>). The question may remain open whether the historian thought the foreign logographer not worth mentioning <sup>8</sup>), or whether Deinarchos in the action which he brought against Proxenos after his return wrongly, but for transparent reasons, described himself as a victim of political persecution <sup>9</sup>).

Manifestly F 66 is not a passage quoted strictly verbatim: apart from the omission of the names of the εἰσαγγελοθέντες <sup>10</sup>) and the vague ὕστερον <sup>11</sup>), this is shown by the opening words τοῦ γὰρ Ἀναξικράτους ἀρχοντος instead of the regular heading—Ἀναξικράτης (with the demotikon following) ἐπὶ τούτου <sup>12</sup>). Dionysios merely gives a swift survey of the events of the year 307/6 B.C. down to the fact with which he is concerned because it supplies him with the required date for Deinarchos; he also abbreviated the report of the trials, and we are not at all certain that he mentioned all facts recorded by Ph. in the first half of Anaxikrates' year, still less that he gave all that Ph. said about those he mentioned. The excerpt as it stands yields the following facts: (1) in the very beginning of 307/6 B.C. Megara was captured <sup>13</sup>); consequently the siege must have begun in 308/7 B.C. and lasted somewhat more than a month, for Demetrios went to Megara immediately after the occupation of the Peiraeus (dated by Plutarch. *Demetr.* 8, 5 πέμπτη; Θαρρηλιῶνος φθίνοντος, i.e. June 10, 307 B.C.) and the blockade of Munychia, not entering Athens itself (Plutarch. 9, 4). (2) The chronological sequence of events as given by Plutarch—viz. capture of Megara; storming and razing of Munychia; Demetrios' entrance into Athens; solemn restoration of democracy; honorary decrees of the people for the liberators—is correct as against that which we seem to find in Diodoros. That author first gives a consistent and somewhat detailed account of the events in Athens, starting

from Demetrios' entrance into the Peiraieus down to the solemn proceedings in the Assembly (20, 45, 2 - 46, 3), which certainly took place in Hekatombaion and presumably in the first third of that month<sup>14</sup>); a brief sentence about the capture and the treatment of Megara follows (46, 3);  
 5 the account continues with the arrival at the court of Antigonos of the Athenian ambassadors bringing the honorary decrees and Antigonos' orders to Demetrios, which eventually led to the return of the latter to Asia and to the attack on Cyprus (46, 4-5)<sup>15</sup>. I said 'we seem to find' because Plutarch and Diodoros in their historical accounts evidently  
 10 follow the same source, *viz.* the History of the Diadochs by Hieronymos of Kardia<sup>16</sup>). Diodoros renders it much more accurately and with a better perception of what is historically important than Plutarch who, from another, or intermediate, source and not without grave errors<sup>17</sup> concerning both Athens and Megara, takes all kinds of anecdotic stuff  
 15 into his account. It is quite credible that Diodoros followed Hieronymos in the arrangement of his facts; and as he was less interested in Megara than in Athens, the contradiction to Plutarch in the chronological sequence may be due to the casualness with which he inserted into his main narrative the brief sentence about the former town with the wrong contrast  
 20  $\delta \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \omicron\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon \delta\eta\mu\omicron\varsigma \dots \delta \delta\acute{\epsilon} \Delta\eta\mu\acute{\eta}\tau\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ , not even indicating the relation in time. Compare this sentence<sup>18</sup>) (in which the considerable abridgement is manifest) with the facts as given by Plutarch<sup>19</sup>), omitting the anecdotic stuff<sup>20</sup>), and taking into account that he also severely abbreviated his material, and one will perceive at once that the Megarian affair did not  
 25 take such an even and simple course as appears in Diodoros (and Plutarch). There seems to be hardly a doubt that the 'deliverance' of Megara (Plutarch), which for the time being merely consisted in the expulsion of Kassandros' garrison and the looting of the town, and the 'restoration of autonomy' to that town with the subsequent honorary decrees for the  
 30 liberator (Diodoros) do not mean the same. The restoration of autonomy may have been (and probably was) later than the solemn proceedings in Athens<sup>21</sup>), *i.e.* at the point of time where Diodoros inserts his sentence. The real difficulty in the report of Diodoros is different: he mentions the honours conferred on 'the liberators' of Athens twice: ch. 45, 3-5 immediately after  
 35 the occupation of the Peiraieus<sup>22</sup>) and ch. 46, 2 on the occasion of the solemn state action (towards the middle of Hekatombaion?). I shall come back to this point presently. (3) The 'liberation' of Athens was narrated in Ph.s report under two Attic years as in the *Athis* of the Parian Marble B 20/I, where Megara is omitted and not to be sought in the gap:  $\acute{\alpha}\phi' \omicron\upsilon$

Δημήτριος ὁ Ἀντιγόνου τὸ [ν Π]ειραιᾶ πολιορκήσας ἔλαβεν, [καὶ Δημή-  
 τριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς ἐξέπεσεν Ἀθηνῶν, ἔτη ΔΔΔΔΙΙΙ, ἄρχοντος] Ἀθήνησι Καιρί-  
 μου. — ἀφ' οὗ Δημήτριος Μουνυχίαν κατέσκαψεν, καὶ Κύπρον ἔλαβεν . . . .  
 [ἔτη Δ]ΔΔΔΙΙΙ, ἄρχοντος Ἀθήνησιν Ἀναξικράτους. Plutarch *Demetr.* 8, 5 con-  
 firms this, as far as his statement goes, by his date for the entrance into  
 the Peiraeus; he does not indicate years or the beginning of a new year.  
 Diodoros 20, 45-46 has the whole story under Anaxikrates, and Eusebios  
 is of no use for such questions <sup>23</sup>). (4) There remains a doubt which F 66  
 alone does not solve, *viz.* whether F 165/6 (which deal with the honours  
 conferred on Antigonos and Demetrios) belong before or (rather) after F 66,  
 or, in more general terms, when the motion(s) of Stratokles were passed, or  
 under what year Ph. reported them. The account of Hieronymos as pre-  
 served in Diodor. 20, 46, 1-2 and Plutarch *Demetr.* 10, 1 knows about a state  
 action which was evidently carefully staged: after the razing of Munychia  
 Demetrios enters Athens on a special invitation and συναγωγῶν τὸν δῆμον  
 ἀπέδωκε τὴν πάτριον πολιτείαν <sup>24</sup>) or, as Diodoros states more accurately,  
 ὀλόκληρον <sup>25</sup>) τῷ δήμῳ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἀποκατέστησεν, καὶ φίλιαν καὶ συμμα-  
 χίαν πρὸς αὐτοὺς συνέθετο, οἱ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι, γράψαντος ψήφισμα Στρατοκλέους,  
 ἐψηφίσαντο χρυσᾶς μὲν εἰκόνας ἐφ' ἄρματος στήσαι τοῦ τε Ἀντιγόνου καὶ Δη-  
 μητρίου πλησίον Ἀρμοδίου καὶ Ἀριστογείτονος κτλ. It is quite conceivable  
 that this Constituent Assembly (as one might call it) occurred at the same  
 place in Ph.'s report: there would be room for it between ἀπέδωκε τῷ δήμῳ  
 and ὕστερον, and it would not be surprising if Dionysios in his swift  
 survey had passed over the action; important as it was, it did not concern  
 his purpose. In any case, the vague ὕστερον suggests a gap in the ex-  
 cerpt <sup>26</sup>). A strict proof cannot be given: (a) because in the excerpt the  
 grammatical object of ἀπέδωκε is not the πάτριος πολιτεία or the ὀλόκληρος  
 ἐλευθερία, but Munychia; (b) because Diodoros mentions the honours  
 conferred on the liberators twice <sup>27</sup>). Although in such cases a reduplica-  
 tion by mistake seems likely where Diodoros is concerned, it is not certain;  
 there always remains the possibility of a second source <sup>28</sup>). That source  
 might have reported the Athenian honorary decrees not after the return  
 of Demetrios from Megara, but directly after the capture of the Pei-  
 raeus, the κήρυγμα of Demetrios (known to Plutarch. *Demetr.* 8), and  
 the deposition of Demetrios of Phaleron, which immediately followed  
 these events. Nor can we absolutely exclude the possibility that Hiero-  
 nymos mentioned the honours for the liberators in two passages: first  
 on the occasion of the previous transactions which created transitory  
 or provisional conditions, and afterwards when the position of Athens

was finally regulated. It is not easy to imagine what the Athenians decreed at the former occasion, but it is at least conceivable that something correct is behind the seeming reduplication as well as behind the seemingly wrong date of the capture of Megara <sup>29</sup>). A decision solely based on our literary evidence is impossible, but some progress can be made from epigraphic evidence. The exceedingly careful investigation into the Athenian calendar of 307/6 B.C. by Pritchett-Meritt <sup>30</sup>) has led to the result, quite certain in my opinion, that *I G<sup>2</sup> II 456* 'necessitates a prytany division for twelve tribes at least as early as prytany II of 307/6 and preferably as early as the last month of 308/7'; and this result is, of course, not shaken by the fact that the new phylai Antigonis and Demetrias do not begin to function until the middle of the year 307/6. They occupy the seventh and eighth place in Gamelion and Gamelion II, the intercalation of which was resolved upon during the first Gamelion. A certain amount of time, which one must not assume too short, was needed for the establishment of the phylai; the earlier we can date the decree the better it is. As a matter of fact it is self-evident that the democratic machine must have begun to work in some form or other immediately after the removal of Demetrios of Phaleron in the last days of Thargelion 308/7 B.C.

20 There only remains the question what that form was: did the provisional government under Stratokles (as we might call it) summon regular assemblies (or any assemblies) of the people and bring forward motions before the solemn state action in Hekatombaion 307/6 had taken place <sup>31</sup>)? Or did this government content itself with making preparatory administrative measures for the restoration of what Diodoros calls the *ἀλόκληρος ἐλευθερία* and for the conclusion of the treaty of *φιλία* and *συνμαχία* with Antigonos and Demetrios, by which the international position of Athens was to be incontestably determined? In the latter case the government would not have brought forward resolutions to be accepted by the people until the first Assembly of the new year. I do not think that Diodor. 20, 45, 5 is sufficient for deciding in favour of the former alternative, for we cannot tell whether his remark is based upon a positive knowledge of the preparatory work, or whether the passage is to be regarded as a wrong reduplication (or a variant) from another and inferior source. Personally I have no doubt that Ph. on the whole agreed with Hieronymos, and this means that the assembly of the people in the first decade of Hekatombaion 307/6 B.C. was the first official one. Its order of the day consisted in listening to a speech of Demetrios and answering it by giving its consent to the treaty of alliance prepared by

the Council and passing the psephism (also prepared) which proposed a series of honours to be conferred on the two kings. It possibly rejected motions for further honours brought forward by ὑπερβαλλόμενοι ἀνελευθερία τὸν Στρατοκλέα, these latter not being moved by the 'government' and not previously discussed and accepted by the Council.

(67) The fragment reads like a verbatim quotation. But if this is valid for the opening words too (and it would be difficult to understand why Dionysios<sup>1)</sup> should have altered just them), the quotation does not represent the heading of the year for which the *Atthides* use the fixed formula ὁ δεῖνα· ἐπὶ τούτου<sup>2)</sup>. It thus becomes doubtful whether Ph. communicated the omens (referring to the condemned men of F 66) as an independent entry at the beginning of a year, or whether they occurred in a more or less extensive discussion *e.g.* about the political situation after the restoration of democracy by Demetrios in 307/6 B.C. (F 66), or after the two years' government of Olympiodoros in 294/3 and 293/2 B.C.<sup>3)</sup>. The problem of F 67, though it is quoted from the ninth book, is to assign it to its date: was it written in the year of Koroibos or in that of Philippos, 306/5 or 292/1 B.C.<sup>4)</sup>? The fact that in Dionysios' excerpt on Deinarchos the fragment follows F 66 immediately is not decisive: he had given the archons of the φυγή and those of the κάθοδος according to Ph. already in ch. 2, and it would be but a slight negligence if he did not repeat the latter here. The inference that F 67 must have been written before F 69/70 would be fallacious: a discussion like that assumed here may be anticipatory or retrospective, and the concluding words καὶ τὴν κρίσιν ἐπιτελεσθῆναι συνέβη show that Ph. anyhow did not keep to the strict chronological order. They at least cannot have been written until after the fulfilment of the interpretation, that is a considerable time after the event<sup>5)</sup>. They seem to betray a kind of quiet triumph about an issue which in the ordinary course of events must have appeared self-evident to the *mantis*. But Ph. may have endured sarcasms and even serious complaints from the government during the first years after 306/5 B.C. Also in his text there may have been a ὕστερον or ὀψέ, as there frequently was in anticipatory remarks; he may even have named the archon under whom his interpretation was fulfilled, and Dionysios (who had named Philippos previously) did not care to excerpt the further text: there are several quotations in him and in others which are not complete, though apparently verbatim<sup>6)</sup>.

We gain from F 67 for Ph. with certainty two things: (1) an idea of his practical and official activity<sup>7)</sup>; (2) a *terminus post* for the composi-

tion of his ninth book <sup>8</sup>), for nobody will try to find in the concluding words a subsequent addition which would involve a second 'corrected' edition of the *Atthis*. εἰς τὸ Πανδρόσειον] The Pandroseion in this instance does not mean the chapel which may have existed <sup>9</sup>), it is the very old precinct of Pandrosos in which the sacred olive stood and under it (as we learn only from Ph.) an altar of Zeus Herkeios, the guardian of this precinct. Such a precinct cannot be part of the 'temple of Polias'. The unfortunate dog probably began by sniffing about in the temple of Polias; when chased it fled into the Pandroseion and climbed upon the altar, whence it may have faced the pursuers defiantly. The terms εἰσελθοῦσα - δῦσα - ἀναβάσα - κατέκειτο are precise, the event is graphically described, and the topography is clear, as we expect in Ph. ἀστήρ] The description of the star does not suggest a comet. In *Das Marm. Par.*, 1904, p. 203 f. I should have done better to reject outright Munro's reference to *Marm. Par.* B 25 ἀφ' οὗ [κομήτης ἀσ]τήρ ἐφάνη instead of admitting the possibility of dating F 67 in 303/2 B.C. <sup>10</sup>).

(68) About Aulon as a proper name in Attica see Milchhoefer *RE* II col. 2413 no. 1; a dedication to Dionysos Auloneus occurs in *IG*<sup>2</sup> II 4745, and the seat of his priest in the theatre *ibid.* 5078. The plural makes it appear doubtful whether Ph. mentioned this god, and if so whether he mentioned him alone. The appellative and the proper name occur elsewhere too. Dionysos appears as deity of the αὐλών also at Tarentum <sup>1</sup>), and perhaps in Naxos <sup>2</sup>); in Messenia it is Asklepios <sup>3</sup>). It is also comprehensible that nymphs are called αὐλωνιάδες and αὐλιάδες <sup>4</sup>).

25 (69-70) Plutarch. *Demetr.* 26 τότε δ' οὖν ἀναζευγνύων εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας ἔγραψεν ὅτι βούλεται παραγεγόμενος εὐθὺς μνηθῆναι καὶ τὴν τελετὴν ἄπασαν ἀπὸ τῶν μικρῶν ἄχρι τῶν ἐποπτικῶν παραλαβεῖν. (2) τοῦτο δὲ οὐ θεμιτὸν ἦν οὐδὲ γεγονὸς πρότερον, ἀλλὰ τὰ μικρὰ τοῦ Ἀνθεστηριῶνος ἐτελοῦντο, τὰ δὲ μέγαρα τοῦ Βοηδρομιῶνος· ἐπώπτεον δὲ τοῦλάχιστον ἀπὸ τῶν μεγάλων ἑνιαυτὸν δια-  
30 λείποντες. (3) ἀναγνωσθέντων δὲ τῶν γραμμάτων, μόνος ἐτόλμησεν ἀντειπεῖν Πυθίδωρος ὁ δαιδούχος, ἐπέρανε δ' οὐδέν· ἀλλὰ Στρατοκλέους γνώμην εἰπόντος, Ἀνθεστηριῶνα τὸν Μουνυχιῶνα ψηφισαμένους καλεῖν καὶ νομίζειν, ἐτέλουσιν αὐτῷ Δημητρίῳ τὰ πρὸς Ἄγραν. (4) καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα πάλιν ἐξ Ἀνθεστηριῶνος ὁ Μουνυχιῶν γενόμενος Βοηδρομιῶν ἐδέξατο τὴν λοιπὴν τελετὴν, ἅμα καὶ τὴν  
35 ἐποπτεῖαν τοῦ Δημητρίου προσεπιλαβόντος. (5) διὸ καὶ Φιλιππίδης (*III* 308, 25 K) τὸν Στρατοκλέα λαιδωρῶν ἐποίησεν ἢ τὸν ἑνιαυτὸν συντεμῶν εἰς μῆν' ἓνα. The resemblance of F 69-70 with this detailed account is so striking that we shall not hesitate in assigning F 69 (note the present tense) to a direct speech of the daiduchos <sup>1</sup>), who presumably directed his attack not against

Demetrios himself but against the mover of the proposal Stratokles (οὔτος). Accordingly F 70 would be Ph.s report about the issue of the debate. The dating is not without difficulties: if Demetrios put his request in a letter, the winter 304/3 B.C. which he spent in Athens would be impossible. Plutarch narrates the story in a group of anecdotes and general considerations about the character of Demetrios which fill chs. 25, 6-27, 14. One would have to refer ἀναζευνγύων to the Peloponnese, which is the subject of the narrative in 25, 1-25, 5, but Plutarch forgot the campaign against Thessaly, and in ch. 28, 2 he forgot to state where Demetrios was when he received the order of Antigonos to return to Asia. Diod. 20, 110, 1 expressly says that Demetrios διατρίβων ἐν ταῖς Ἀθήναις ἔσπευδε μνηθῆναι before he μνηθεὶς ἀνέζευξεν ἐκ τῶν Ἀθηναίων for Euboeia and Thessaly, where (20, 111, 1-3) he receives the order τὴν ταχίστην διαβιβάζειν τὰς δυνάμεις εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν. All this happens in the year 302/1 B.C., in which the Parian Marble B 26 probably entered the battle of Ipsos, which Diodoros (21, 1) dates at 301/0 B.C. The source of Diodoros and Plutarch seems to be the same, but I should prefer to put confidence in the words εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας ἔγραψε κτλ., thus dating the request of Demetrios after the order to return; this would explain, and to a certain degree excuse, his indecent hurry. Then the Munychion with which the Athenian politicians juggled would be that of the Attic year 302/1 B.C. (spring or early summer 301), not (as is usually assumed) that of 303/2 (spring 302). Demetrios probably sailed from a Thessalian harbour to Ephesos; but a brief visit by ship to Athens, where everything was prepared for his initiation, is conceivable, and if the battle of Ipsos was fought in September 301 B.C. it would also be possible as to the time<sup>3)</sup>. But it is, of course, not impossible that he wrote when he was still in the Peloponnese, and in that case the chronological sequence of events as given by Diodoros would be correct.

- 30 (71) Aristot. Ἀθπ. 49, 1 δοκιμάζει δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἵππους ἢ βουλή . . . . δοκιμάζει δὲ καὶ τοὺς προ[δ]ρ[ό]μους, οἱ τινες ἀν αὐτῇ δοκῶσιν ἐπιτήδειοι προδρομεῖν εἶναι, κἂν τιν' ἀποχειροτονήσῃ, καταβέβηκεν οὗτος. δοκιμάζει δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἀμίππους (Wyse ἀνίππους L), κἂν τιν' ἀποχειροτονήσῃ, πέπαιται μισθοφορῶν οὗτος. Pollux 1, 130 ἐκ δὲ τῆς σκευῆς οἱ ἄνδρες ὧδε ὀνομάζονται . . . .
- 35 (131) τοξόται, τοξοφόροι, ἱππῆς, ἱππακοντισταί, ἱπποτοξόται, δορατοφόροι, κοντοφόροι, ὑπασπισταί, σκευοφόροι, ἱππαγωγοί, ἄμιπποι. δύο δὲ οὗτοι εἶχον ἵππους, καὶ ὁ ἕτερος προσήρτητο θατέρω, καὶ μεμελετήκασαν μεταπηδᾶν εἰς ἐκἄτερον· ἦν δ' αὐτοῖς τὸ σφίσιμα τοῦ ἀκραιφνεστέροις χρῆσθαι πρὸς τὰ ἔργα τοῖς ἵπποις, ὅπως ὁδοὺς τε μακροτέρας διανύοιεν καὶ εἰεν αὐτοῖς ἀκοπώτεροι. (132)

ἦν δέ τι καὶ ἕτερον εἶδος ἵππέων διμάχαι, Ἀλεξάνδρου τὸ εὖρημα, κουφοτέραν  
 πεζοῦ ὀπλίτου καὶ βαρυτέραν ἵππέως ἔχοντες σκευήν, ἐξησκημένοι πρὸς ἄμφω,  
 καὶ τὴν ἐκ γῆς καὶ τὴν ἀφ' ἵππου μάχην, ὅπως ἐν μὲν τοῖς ἵππασίμοις ἵππεύοιεν,  
 εἰ δέ τοι εἰς ἄφιππα ἀφίκοντο, μὴ εἶεν ἀπόμαχοι παντάπασι, μηδὲ πάθοιεν  
 5 τὸ πάθευμα τὸ Λύδιον<sup>1</sup>). ἀλλὰ τὸν μὲν ἵππον παρελάμβανεν ἐξεπίτηδες ἐπ'  
 αὐτῶι τούτῳ παρεπόμενός τις ὑπέρτης, ὁ δ' ἐκ τοῦ ἵππου καταβάς εὐθύς  
 ὀπλίτης ἦν. Pap. Amhurst 12 from a Ὑπόμνημα of Aristarchos on Herodt. I  
 (ch. 215) ἀνιπ[οι οὐ]χεὶ ἀλλὰ ἀμιπ[ποιοι]. Ἴπποιοι δύο [εὐ]άγωγοι ἰμαῖσι δεδε-  
 μένοι καὶ [ἐπ'] αὐτῶν τινες ὀχοῦμενοι. οἱ ἦρωες τοῖς ἄρμασιν προσήλανον,  
 10 καὶ οὕτως ἀπέβαινον, οἱ δὲ πρὸς ἐλάσσοσιν ὁ μὲν ἀπέβαινε, ὁ δὲ μένων παρ-  
 εἶχετο τὴν τοῦ ἡνίοχου χρεῖαν. Eustath. *Od.* ε 371 Πausanias (F 45 Schw)  
 δὲ φησὶ καὶ τινὰς ἵππους ἀμιππους, εἰπὼν ὅτι ἀμιπποιοι ἵπποιοι ἐξευγμένοι χωρὶς  
 δίφρου, κληθέντες οὕτως ἐπεὶ (φησὶν) ἐπὶ δύο κέλητας ἀνέβαινον, ὁ μὲν ἡνιοχῶν,  
 ὁ δ' ὀπλίτης· ἀπὸ τοίνυν τοῦ ἅμα ἀμφοτέρους καθίζεσθαι, εἰ καὶ ἴδια (φησὶν)  
 15 ἑκατέρους, ἀμιπποιοὶ τοιοῦτοὶ ἐλέγοντο<sup>2</sup>). Phot. *Berol.* p. 92, 20 R (cf. *Lexeis*  
 p. 205, 5 ff. Bkr) ἀμιππον· <δύο><sup>3</sup>) ἵπποιοι ἐξευγμένοι τοῖς τραχήλοις χωρὶς  
 δίφρου, ὁ πάλαι καὶ ξυωρὶς ἐκαλεῖτο καὶ συωρὶς· ἦν δὲ ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ ἐτέρου  
 καθεζόμενος ἡνίοχος, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ἐτέρου ὀπλίτης· καὶ νῦν δὲ χρῶνται περὶ ἀρχῆς  
 Ἀλίβυες οἱ προσαγορευόμενοι Ζευγνῖται add. *Suda*><sup>4</sup>)· ἀπὸ οὖν τοῦ ἅμα ἀμφο-  
 20 τέρους καθίζεσθαι ἐκλήθη ἀμιππον. Hesych. s. v. ἀμιπποιοι· δύο ἵπποιοι συν-  
 ἐξευγμένοι. Schol. *Hom.* *BT II.* O 679 ὁ μὲν εἰς οὖν ἐξευγμένος ἵππος κέλης  
 ὠνόμασται, οἱ δὲ δύο ἀμιπποιοι, ὁ καὶ ξυωρὶς, οἱ δὲ τέσσαρες τέτρωρον καὶ  
 τέθριππον.

Let us examine Ph. first. His quotation can simply be explained by a  
 25 reference to Aristotle who mentions side by side πρόδρομοι in the sense  
 of mounted and ἀμιπποιοι in the sense of unmounted troops<sup>5</sup>). This is made  
 intelligible by the history of the corps in Athens: it was formed at the  
 earliest after the battle of Mantinea in 362 B.C. (the conclusion *e silentio*  
 is justified in this case), when Epameinondas τοῦ ἵππικου ἐμβολον ἰσχυρὸν  
 30 ἐποίησατο καὶ ἀμιππους πεζοὺς συνέταξεν αὐτοῖς, while the enemy, though  
 also gathering their cavalry in a kind of phalanx, left them ἐρημον πεζῶν  
 ἀμιππων<sup>6</sup>). Of course, Epameinondas did not act on the advice of  
 Xenophon; but to the military mind of the latter such a support of cavalry  
 by light infantry commended itself: in *Ἡρόπαιρική*. 5, 13 he draws the  
 35 inference ἵππαρχικὸν δὲ καὶ τὸ διδάσκειν τὴν πόλιν ὡς ἀσθενὲς τὸ πεζῶν  
 ἐρημον ἵππικὸν πρὸς τὸ ἅμ' ἵπποις<sup>7</sup>) πεζοὺς ἔχον· ἵππαρχικὸν δὲ καὶ τὸ λα-  
 βόντα πεζοὺς αὐτοῖς χρῆσθαι κτλ. The task of πρόδρομοι and ἀμιπποιοι  
 combined is revealed by the same two passages: they are not only  
 and not even primarily reconnaissance troops and skirmishers; they are



a fighting troop. What remains doubtful is on what occasion Ph. mentioned them<sup>8</sup>). It would be a very obvious suggestion that in this instance too<sup>9</sup>) the  $\tau$  of the number belongs to  $\tau\eta(\iota)$ , and that Ph. spoke about these troops not in his sixteenth book (the contents of which we do not know) but in his sixth, in the compass of which a mention of their introduction would be suitable<sup>10</sup>). We do not know how long the troop existed in Athens.

We now proceed to the  $\alpha\mu\iota\pi\pi\omega\iota$  themselves, since the tradition about this term must be cleared up<sup>11</sup>). (1) Without doubt the  $\alpha\mu\iota\pi\pi\omega\iota$  of our historical sources<sup>12</sup>) were light, not mounted, infantry. The evidence of Thuk. 5, 57 may be added to Xenophon: in the war of Agis against Argos (418 B.C.) the Boeotian contingent consists of 5000 hoplites  $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\tau\omicron\sigma\sigma\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota$   $\psi\iota\lambda\omicron\iota$ , 500 horsemen  $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\alpha\mu\iota\pi\pi\omega\iota$   $\iota\sigma\omicron\iota$ . As far as we know Greek military practice, the  $\alpha\mu\iota\pi\pi\omega\iota$  are peculiar to the Boeotians<sup>13</sup>), in whose army they stand in a similar relation to the cavalry as the  $\psi\iota\lambda\omicron\iota$  stand to the heavy infantry. The manner of fighting of the combined troop may very well be traditional, and if we observe reasonable caution we may form an idea of it from that of the *Suebi* of Ariovistus as described by Caesar B. G. 1, 48: *Ariovistus . . . exercitum castris continuit, equestri proelio cotidie contendit. genus hoc erat pugnae quo se Germani exercuerant: equitum milium erant sex, totidem numero pedites velocissimi ac fortissimi, quos ex omni copia singuli singulos suae salutis causa delegerant; cum his in proeliis versabantur, ad hos se equites recipiebant; hi siquid erat durius concurrebant; siqui graviore vulnere accepto equo deciderat circumstabant; siquo erat longius prodeundum aut celerius recipiendum, tanta erat horum exercitatione celeritas ut iubis sublevati equorum cursum adaequarent.* In any case this is a good parallel as to the matter<sup>14</sup>): these Suebian *pedites velocissimi* are the same as what the Boeotians called  $\alpha\mu\iota\pi\pi\omega\iota$ . The name expresses exactly what they are; it signifies in a linguistically unobjectionable manner<sup>15</sup>) their task as described somewhat vaguely by Xenophon and paraphrased by Harpokration with  $\sigma\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon$   $\iota\pi\pi\omicron\iota\varsigma$   $\sigma\tau\omicron\alpha\tau\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ . (2) In contrast to the  $\alpha\mu\iota\pi\pi\omega\iota$  of the historians (and perhaps of the ethnographers, too) those occurring only in the lexicographers are linguistically not quite so unobjectionable, and factually their reality is, let us say, somewhat doubtful<sup>16</sup>). They are different kinds of mounted troops, easily to be distinguished from each other and from the Boeotian  $\alpha\mu\iota\pi\pi\omega\iota$ : (a) Pollux'  $\alpha\mu\iota\pi\pi\omega\iota$  are a kind of cavalry in which every horseman has two horses. The description in itself is clear and good; unfortunately a historical note like that on the following  $\delta\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\chi\alpha\iota$ , is lacking. Thus we

cannot tell on his evidence alone, whether they are Greek horsemen, who were actually called ἄμπποι, or whether Pollux only applies the term to barbarian horsemen, because their spare horse does not run as an off-horse but is attached to the saddle-horse. Personally I do not doubt  
 5 that he means the ἀμφιπποι, who are well-known from historical and military authors <sup>17</sup>). (b) The ἀμπποι of Hesych. s.v. διμάχαι · οἱ λεγόμενοι ἀμπποι, οἵτινες ὅτε μὲν πεζῆι, ὅτε δὲ ἐφ' ἵππων μάχονται are due to an inaccurate abridgement. Pollux correctly distinguishes the διμάχαι from the ἀμπποι as being ἕτερον εἶδος ἵππέων. His description is clear and good also  
 10 in this case <sup>18</sup>): the διμάχαι are no more 'mounted infantry' than are the Boeotian ἀμπποι but exactly what their name says—a troop to be used both as cavalry and as infantry; to use a modern term dragoons. (c) Concerning the ἀμπποι lucidly described by Pausanias Atticista and in the Lexeis, who both probably follow Aristarchos <sup>19</sup>), it appears doubtful  
 15 (and the doubt is not settled by the comparison with the Homeric charioteers) whether the hoplites mounted on horses and freed from the necessity of controlling them by the attendant who was also mounted were supposed to fight on horse-back or on foot; i.e. whether they were cuirassiers or mounted (heavy) infantry. Because of the comparison  
 20 we cannot very well doubt the existence of such a troop. That it was a Greek troop actually called ἀμπποι is, however, even more improbable than it is in regard to the ἀμπποι of Pollux; but unfortunately the historical note of the Suda, uncertain as to its origin, does not help to place it ethnically. It is comprehensible that these Alibydes-Zeugnitai,  
 25 being ἵπποι ἐξευγμένοι χωρὶς δίφρου, were compared with the Homeric chariot-drivers <sup>20</sup>). But the assertion that τοῦτ' ἔστι τὸ παρ' Ὀμήρῳ »θρῶσιων ἄλλοτ' ἐπ' ἄλλον» and that this was the meaning of ἀμπποι involves misinterpretation. What *Il.* O 679/84 describes is not a cavalry action, but (to express it quite neutrally) a performer's feat (γύμνασμα  
 30 Eustath.) of a good horseman with four horses. Other interpreters of Homer have quite appropriately looked to the circus for an explanation <sup>21</sup>): Schol. *T Il.* O 683 Δημήτριος δὲ ὁ Γουπεσῶς <φῆσι> θεωρηκέναι τινὸς μεταβαίνοντος ἀνεμπόδιστον τηροῦντος τὸν δρόμον τῶν ἵππων, κατέχοντος τοὺς χαλινοὺς · καὶ νῦν δὲ ἐν Ῥώμῃ ποιοῦσὶ τινες <sup>22</sup>).

35 (72) *Lex. rhet.* p. 262, 25 Bkr Ἡπειωνία · μέρος τι τοῦ Πειραιῶς, ἀπὸ τινος Ἡπειωνοῦ κατασκευάσαντος. Schol. *Patm.* Thukyd. 8, 90, 1 τόπος πηλείων Πειραιέως. Thuk. 8, 90, 1 (411 B.C.) Φρόνιχός τε . . . καὶ Ἀρίσταρχος . . . καὶ Πείσανδρος καὶ Ἀντιφῶν . . . τὸ ἐν τῇ Ἡπειωνείᾳ καλουμένην τεῖχος ἐποιοῦντο . . . (3) ἦν δὲ τοῦ τεῖχους ἡ γνώμη αὕτη, ὡς ἔφη Ἐθραμένης <sup>1</sup>) καὶ οἱ

μετ' αὐτοῦ, . . . ἵνα τοὺς πολεμίους μᾶλλον, ὅταν βούλωνται, καὶ ναυσὶ καὶ πε-  
 ζῶι δέξωνται. (4) χηλὴ γάρ ἐστι τοῦ Πειραιῶς ἢ Ἡετιωνεία, καὶ παρ' αὐτὴν  
 εὐθὺς ὁ ἔσπλους ἐστίν. ἐτειχίζετο οὖν οὕτω ξὺν τῷι πρότερον πρὸς ἡπει-  
 ρον ὑπάρχοντι τείχει, ὥστε καθεζομένων ἐς αὐτὸ ἀνθρώπων ὀλίγων ἄρχειν τοῦ  
 5 ἔσπλου· ἐπ' αὐτὸν γὰρ τὸν ἐπὶ τῷι στόματι τοῦ λιμένος στενοῦ ὄντος τὸν ἔτε-  
 ρον πύργον ἐτελεύτα τὸ τε παλαιὸν τὸ πρὸς ἡπειρον καὶ τὸ ἐντὸς τὸ καινὸν  
 τείχος τειχίζομενον πρὸς θάλασσαν. Nobody will doubt a book perhaps  
 of the περί-type criticising special points of Demon's *Atthis*, even though  
 according to the Suda (T 1) Ph.'s whole *Atthis* was directed against  
 10 Demon<sup>2)</sup>. The suggestion that F 72 refers to 411/0 rather than to 412/1  
 B.C. is probably correct, since the former seems to be the only year in  
 which the Eetioneia played a prominent part; but the date holds good  
 for Demon only, not for Ph. Also the short article of Harpokration does  
 not permit of determining what Ph. had to object to in this case. Perhaps  
 15 (but this is a pure guess) Demon had derived the name of the place from  
 an epithet of Athena<sup>3)</sup>, while Ph. conversely derived the epithet from  
 the name of the place and that again from a mythical or historical  
 eponym. Who that eponym was we cannot tell with any certainty, as  
 Harpokration only supplies the vague designation ὁ κατακτησάμενος τὴν  
 20 γῆν<sup>4)</sup>. There is no evidence of the name in Athens<sup>5)</sup>; it was rare as a human  
 name generally, if it existed at all<sup>6)</sup>. It occurs (1) in the Trojan sphere  
 for heroic characters<sup>7)</sup>; (2) in the highly mythical pedigree of the Kypse-  
 lids: the father of Kypselos is Ἡετίων ὁ Ἐχεκράτεος, δήμου μὲν ἑὼν ἐκ Πέ-  
 τρης, ἀτὰρ τὸ ἀνέκαθεν Λαπίθης τε καὶ Καινείδης<sup>8)</sup>. From here a connecting  
 25 line may extend to Athens: the Philaids among the suitors of Agariste,  
 Ἴπποκλείδης ὁ Τεισάνδρου, is τὸ ἀνέκαθεν τοῖσι ἐν Κορίνθῳ Κυψελίδησι προσ-  
 ἦκων<sup>9)</sup>, and the pedigree of the Philaids begins with Philaios, son of  
 Aias and Lysidike, daughter of the Lapith Koronos<sup>10)</sup> who, again,  
 is a son of Kaineus<sup>11)</sup>. However this may be, all particulars remain  
 30 obscure: we do not know whether the name of Eetion was also introduced  
 into the prehistoric parts of one of the pedigrees or into both; whether  
 the Philaids had landed property in the Eetioneia, or (more likely)  
 whether an invention was built on the name.

(Nos. 4-5) Περί τῶν Ἀθήνησι ἀρξάντων of uncertain length and Ὀλυμ-  
 35 πιάδες in two books surely were separate works. Attempts<sup>1)</sup> at uniting  
 them to a kind of Ἀρχόντων καὶ Ὀλυμπιάδων ἀναγραφὴ, like the one  
 written later on by the Athenian Stesikleides (or Ktesikles)<sup>2)</sup>, merely  
 create difficulties, for in a chronicle the limitation to a few decades of  
 the fourth century would be altogether incomprehensible<sup>3)</sup>. As to the

first title we had better resign altogether: we simply do not know why Ph. dealt with the period from 374/3 to 350/49 or 319/8 B.C. in a special book, nor do we know what were the contents of it <sup>4</sup>). Of the three years 319/8 B.C. (perhaps the concluding year of the sixth book of the *Atthis* <sup>5</sup>), alone can be said to mark an epoch; but even so we cannot prove that the Apollodoros mentioned in the title was the archon of 319/8 B.C. Concerning the second title 'Ολυμπιάδες more likely suggestions can be made, although we cannot reach certainty. A work of Timaios is entitled 'Ολυμπιονῆκαι ἤτοι Χρονικὰ Πραξιδικὰ (?) <sup>6</sup>), and for Eratosthenes we know <sup>10</sup> of 'Ολυμπιονῆκαι besides the Χρονογραφίαι <sup>7</sup>). No doubt these two famous chronographers laid the foundations of their systems by their 'Ολυμπιονῆκαι, for they cannot possibly have been interested in the local affairs of Elis. Such an interest perhaps was not alone decisive even for the 'Ολυμπιονικῶν ἀναγραφὴ of Hippias, and even less for the 'Ολυμπιονῆκαι <sup>15</sup> ascribed to Aristotle <sup>8</sup>). It is by no means certain that the same can be said of Ph.: we know that he wrote about Alkman, the Pythagoreans, and other topics which were neither concerned with Athens nor purely historical as to their character <sup>9</sup>). Even the title 'Ολυμπιάδες, compared with the usual title 'Ολυμπιονῆκαι (there is a tradition in these matters) might <sup>20</sup> contradict the suggestion, obvious otherwise, that his book was a technical preparation for the *Atthis* (as Timaios' 'Ολυμπιονῆκαι was for his 'Ιστορίαι), caused by the epoch-making achievement of Timaios. Again we do not know whether Ph. had a chronographic system reaching beyond Athens <sup>10</sup>). But as in later times <sup>11</sup>) 'Ολυμπιάδες used to be a title <sup>25</sup> of universal chronological handbooks, it is at least not impossible that Ph. composed such a summary of Greek history for that portion of his research which extended beyond Attica. He may even have felt that for the *Atthis* itself a modern substitute for Hellanikos' 'Ιέρειαι was wanted, for it was in his time that Hippias' Olympiads began to supersede other <sup>30</sup> general forms of dating for purposes of scientific research. The alternative would be: if the 'Ολυμπιάδες was a universal historical summary, the book belongs to Ph.'s earlier works; if it was technically chronographic, it belongs to the time of preparation for his masterwork, the great *Atthis* <sup>12</sup>). But even this alternative is far from being sure.

<sup>35</sup> (73-75) The works about the Tetrapolis, the islands Salamis and Delos had better be treated together, in spite of the different form of the titles. For the first the catalogue (Τ Ι) furnishes the full title Περὶ τῆς Τετραπόλεως; it is quoted simply as Τετράπολις, and it probably consisted of one book only. All three deal with regions particularly rich in legends

and antiquities <sup>1)</sup>, or (as Delos <sup>2)</sup>) otherwise of special interest for Athens, and all may have been written long before Ph. thought of a comprehensive *Atthis*. It is rather remarkable that Ph. apparently did not write a special work about Eleusis too, for *Περὶ μυστηρίων τῶν Ἀθήνησι* cannot be regarded as such as (to judge from the title) it probably extended beyond the mysteries *κατ' ἐξοχὴν*. Possibly he found the book of Melanthios sufficient in this case, but it is also possible that the *mantis* Ph. was for whatever reason less interested in Eleusis, or even somewhat hostile to its priesthood. In what form Ph. presented his material cannot be recognized even for the Tetrapolis, from which alone of the three works quotations have come down to us. A purely chronological arrangement is impossible in itself and in view of the titles; periegetic arrangement, perhaps with a historical introduction, is as conceivable as a simple sequence of material questions; the *περί*-form leaves the writer free to adopt any arrangement. Nevertheless, for the Tetrapolis it is obvious to suppose that Ph. first dealt with the region in general and subsequently with the four places in the well-established sequence Marathon, Trikorythos, Oinoe, Probalinthos <sup>3)</sup>. Whether he followed this up with a calendar is quite uncertain, but that matters of cult bulked large in the contents may be taken for granted.

(73) Athenaios has prefaced his voluminous treatise (6, 26-52 p. 234c-248c) on the *νῦν λεγόμενοι παράσιτοι*, viz. the parasites of Comedy and of life, by a number of choice quotations which he surely did not collect himself <sup>4)</sup>. The quotation from Ph. occurs almost at the end, and is almost certainly not taken from Krates, who precedes Ph. and whose article about the parasites *ἐν β' Ἀττικῆς διαλέκτου* Athenaios evidently excerpted verbatim and in its entirety <sup>5)</sup>. Athenaios is generally inclined to use collections and lexica, and after the long excerpt from Krates he contented himself with a superficial reference to Ph. <sup>6)</sup>. It is not absolutely impossible that Ph. actually gave 'the same' as Krates, i.e. that when mentioning the parasites of a cult in the Tetrapolis he went into the question of the institution as a whole by way of a digression; the expression *μνημονεύων κτλ.* may lend colour to such a conjecture. But the composition of Athenaios' introduction makes it appear far more likely that he (or his immediate source) took the group of quotations as a whole from Polemon and according to his custom enlarged this nucleus from other sources <sup>7)</sup>. As far as the maze can be disentangled, Polemon (in a manner very typical of the *σηλοκόπας*) supported his thesis (234 D *παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις εὕρισκομεν τὸν παράσιτον ἱερόν τι χρῆμα* Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.)

καὶ τῶι συνθελῶναι παρόμοιον) with carefully copied monuments from different regions of Attica <sup>5</sup>) which he had, partly at least, unearthed himself; subsequently he quoted literary celebrities, including Kleidemos <sup>6</sup>) and Ph., the earliest Atthidographer and the latest. Then ταῦτά takes up what Kleidemos said and what Athenaios probably abbreviated like the evidence from Ph. Accurate statements of time and place as given for the monumental evidence are lacking in the portion concerned with literature: Athenaios may have found it tedious to copy the detailed descriptive or narrative context, in which the παράσιτοι αἰρεῖσθαι (καταλέγεσθαι) <sup>10</sup> Ἡρακλεῖ occurred.

Whatever the situation regarding the sources may be, the only fact we learn positively and with certainty about Ph. is that he mentioned the parasites of Herakles. It is merely an inference from the title of the book (although a very probable one) that they were primarily those of <sup>15</sup> the Marathonian Herakleion <sup>7</sup>), even if a discussion of the whole institution may have been appended. These parasites are not attested otherwise <sup>8</sup>), we only know that the cult of Herakles in the Tetrapolis was important, although he apparently had no temple there <sup>9</sup>). But the Marathonians maintained πρώτοις Ἑλλήνων σφίσιν Ἡρακλέα θεὸν νομισθῆναι <sup>10</sup>), and <sup>20</sup> among the many Herakleia celebrated in Attika <sup>11</sup>) those of the Tetrapolis were the most important <sup>12</sup>): they included games in which Herakles himself was said to have participated <sup>13</sup>); the penteteris sent to the Tetrapolis from Athens, for which ten hieropoioi were elected, is mentioned by Aristotle <sup>14</sup>) side by side with those to Delos, Brauron, and Eleusis; <sup>25</sup> it was in the Tetrapolis that Athenian claims placed the residence of the Heraklids and the battle in which Eurystheus fell <sup>15</sup>). About all these matters (and Theseus' share in them) we should certainly have found particulars in Ph.

(74) The question about the name (or rather the names) of a country, <sup>30</sup> town, district *etc.* was naturally raised at the opening of all books of a local character, and not only in those <sup>1</sup>). Istros may be valid evidence for the fact that the Titans were discussed also at the opening of the *Atthides* in approximately the same manner as *e.g.* the kings preceding Kekrops <sup>2</sup>). If so, they were not the Titans of Hesiod, whose names and number <sup>35</sup> had been established by that poet once and for all. They were divine beings in a wider sense, of very great age, prior not only to the Olympic gods but perhaps also to the Titans of Hesiod. These individual local figures were grouped together by Ph. (or earlier speculative theologians) under that designation; ἀρχαιότερου can hardly bear another meaning <sup>3</sup>).

On the tradition about Titans in Attica (earlier Titans or those of Hesiod) it is difficult to speak with any certainty, even if we leave Kronos aside who presents a special problem. Pohlenz, cautious though he is, perhaps still overestimates its value when asserting that 'the Titans' in Attica (or in the Tetrapolis) 'must at some time have had a certain vitality', because 'the very old Titan Τιτήνιος has his home at Marathon' <sup>4</sup>). His only support are the two names Titenios of Marathon and Titakos of Aphidna. Of these the former does not seem very old; as a matter of fact the word does not appear to be a personal name at all <sup>5</sup>), rather an epithet. Either an Athenian (?) poet called the eponymous hero, who actually lived *περὶ Μαραθῶνα* <sup>6</sup>), *Μαραθῶν Τιτήνιος*, or the whole matter is a literary speculation of the Atthidographers who wished to explain the designation of Attica as *Τιτανίς γῆ*, or rather wished to prove that Attica was meant by the term <sup>7</sup>). It is no doubt literary invention that this Titan (about whom we learn nothing else) would not fight against the gods <sup>8</sup>). The latter name Titakos may have an etymological connexion with the Titans <sup>9</sup>): he is the eponym of the deme and perhaps also of a clan <sup>10</sup>) of *Τιτακίδαι*, and his home at Aphidna is not too far from Marathon. About him, however, no more was known than what Herodotos reported <sup>11</sup>), and he calls him not a Titan, but *αὐτόχθων*. If Titakos does belong to the Titans, the Athenians and the Aphidnaeans were no longer aware of the fact.

(75) It is dubious whether this fragment is the end of, or a passage from, a probably detailed account of the two theoriai of the Tetrapolis for Apollo. In view of the age and the importance of the cult of Apollo in that region <sup>1</sup>) we may confidently assume that they reach back to the time before the union of Attica; even in later times they continued to exist independently beside the two Athenian theoriai <sup>2</sup>). The facts about the despatch of the theoriai, the *σημεῖα* that one waited for <sup>3</sup>), the clan or clans which attended to them <sup>4</sup>), must have been discussed before: the definite article *τὴν θεωρίαν* of *ἐκ τοῦ γένους* shows this. We expect that the calendar date of the observation (or rather its duration) was stated. But Ph. may have mentioned these things in a general introduction about the worship of Apollo, passing on by some such phrase as *πέμπουσιν δὲ καὶ θεωρίας αὐτῶι* to the particulars which for the greater part are lost to us <sup>5</sup>). That the ascertainment of the will of the gods, which was necessary beforehand, took place in two different sanctuaries, is expressly said only at the end of the excerpt <sup>6</sup>) as an appendix to the statement that the sacrifices were offered during all the

time in which the theoriai were on their way <sup>7</sup>): in the case of the Delphic theoria they were offered in the Pythion of Oinoe, in the case of the Delian in the Delion of Marathon. The excerpt must therefore have been taken from the transition between the general and the special part, but we do not know whether Ph. continued by discussing the individual offerings and the ceremonies at Delphi and Delos, nor whether he confined himself to the facts of the cult or gave also the myths recording the connections of Apollo with the Tetrapolis.

(76-79) *Περὶ μαντικῆς* was a voluminous and (we may assume) important work about Ph.'s own art. In this respect it may be compared with the *Exegetikon* of Kleidemos. But Kleidemos' book can hardly have been more than a book of formulae with a practical purpose <sup>1</sup>), whereas Ph. comprehended the whole domain of divination. The great representatives of that science—for Ph. regards his art as such—were treated historically (F 76/7); the literary work they had left was critically discussed as to its genuineness <sup>2</sup>) (F 79); and the lower species like Engastromythy were not neglected (F 78). The fact that the latter was mentioned in the third book and Orpheus in the first may allow of the inference that the work was arranged according to the several species of divination with perhaps a general historical introduction about the art and its 'inventors', *i.e.* its earliest known representatives. We cannot tell how far Ph. theoretically discussed the value of divination, possibly refuting the attacks on the art itself and its representatives, which began early; nor whether he gave a system; nor whether it was he who established the great difference between *ἀτεχνος* and *ἐντεχνος μαντική* <sup>3</sup>). The work could naturally not be restricted to Athens. We may with some confidence assign to it F 178 about *Θυγαί* (if the *θυσοκοί* are taken from Ph.); F 192 about the *ἐκ φήμης μαντεῖαι* <sup>4</sup>); F 193 about divination *διὰ τῶν ἐμπύρων* in the *Ismenion*; F 195 about the *Θριαί* of Parnassos; perhaps also the detailed discussion on prophetic dreams <sup>5</sup>). The attribution of F 208 about *Musaïos* and F 225 about *Dodona* remains dubious, one of the other works being perhaps more likely. What is new in the book is its comprehensive and scientific character, and this involves publication. It may, in this respect, have been the first in a series of books which, alone or in a wider context, dealt with divination and incidentally raised divination to the rank of a science <sup>6</sup>). Certainly, *mantic books* had existed for a long time just as *magic books* are sure to have existed, but they were secret books, family possessions of the prophets and their heirs <sup>7</sup>). We know of the existence of families of prophets like families of physicians



and artists where the profession descended from father to son through many generations.

- (76-77) Schol. Apoll. Rhod. 2, 684 τὸν Ὀρφέα φασὶν καὶ μάντιν εἶναι. Plin. N. H. 7, 203 *auguria ex avibus Car* (scil. *invenit*) *a quo Caria appellata*; *adiicit ex ceteris animalibus Orpheus* <sup>1)</sup>, *aruspicia Delphus, ignispicia Amphiaraus, extispicia avium Tiresias Thebanus, interpretationem ostentorum et somniorum Amphictyon*. We do not know how Ph. dated Orpheus, but he obviously did not, like the Christian controversialists, regard all Orphic poems as forgeries of Onomakritos <sup>2)</sup>; he <sup>10</sup> acknowledges here (besides others?) a chresmologic poem <sup>3)</sup>, the title of which the Scholia unfortunately have not preserved. The fifth and fourth centuries, as far as we are able to distinguish the tradition <sup>4)</sup>, seem to have regarded Orpheus as the poet of *Τελεταί* in particular, whereas Musaios was *χρησμολόγος*. Thus Sophokles called the latter <sup>5)</sup>, <sup>15</sup> thus Aristophanes makes his distinction in the well-known enumeration of the earliest poets <sup>6)</sup>: Ὀρφεὺς μὲν γὰρ τελετὰς θ' ἡμῖν κατέδειξε φόνων τ' ἀπέχεσθαι, / Μουσαῖος δ' ἐξαέσεις τε νόσων καὶ χρησμούς. According to Herodotos, too, Onomakritos interpolated the *χρησμοί* of Musaios <sup>7)</sup>. The *Atthis* used by the Marm. Par. <sup>8)</sup> (which groups Orpheus, Musaios, <sup>20</sup> Eumolpos together only in so far as they composed for Eleusis) does not mention any *χρησμοί*; the Demeter poem by Orpheus, which this *Atthis* paraphrases, can be said to fall under the notion of *τελεταί* in a wider sense. As late an author as Clement <sup>9)</sup> speaks of *ποιήματα* in connexion with Orpheus, *χρησμοί* in connexion with Musaios; also Orpheus is lacking <sup>25</sup> in his list of the old *χρησμολόγοι*, in which (besides the Βάκιδες, Σίβυλλαι, and many individual names, some of them obviously late) Mopsos appears as the author of a *Μαντική*, which is said actually to have been composed by the Kyrenaean Battos. Orpheus comes into the list only by way of the appendix which collects *μάντιες* of several times mentioned by historians <sup>30</sup> and in which the evidence for Orpheus is taken from Ph. He is in fact the first reliable witness for Orpheus being a prophet, though it must be noticed that we do not know any particulars either of Herodoros' Ὀρφέως καὶ Μουσαίου ἱστορία <sup>10)</sup> or of the treatment of Musaios by Glaukos of Rhegion and (following him?) Aristoxenos ἐν τοῖς Πραξιδαμαντείοις <sup>11)</sup>. <sup>35</sup> It cannot very well be doubted that Ph. was determined by the fact of the poem to which the name of Orpheus was sometimes attached. We may also suppose that he wished to present his readers with the completest possible list of early mantic writing. All the more surprising (provided F 208 allows of exact interpretation) that he excluded Musaios

from his list, thus in a certain sense making Orpheus and Musaios change their roles. We do not know whether he discussed the whole question in detail and perhaps the authorship of the poem quoted as evidence in F 77 as well. Our tradition is so poor, consisting after all merely in a few late notes, that we cannot form a clear idea of Ph.'s proceedings. Thus we cannot answer the question whether he assigned to Orpheus a certain kind of prophecy, as the heurematic source of Pliny did, which probably reaches back to Ph.'s time. But the literary species of the *Heuremata* begins in the second half of the fourth century; Ph. himself wrote a book *Περὶ εὐρημάτων*; and if he discussed every kind of divination, he may conceivably have cited the 'inventors' of that art in *Περὶ μαντικῆς* as well <sup>12</sup>).

(78) Schol. Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1019 (without quotations). Plutarch. *De def. or.* 9 p. 414 E εὐηθεῖς . . . τὸ οἰεσθαι τὸν θεὸν αὐτὸν ὡσπερ τοὺς ἑγγαστριμύθους Εὐρυκλέας πάλαι, νυνὶ δὲ Πύθωνας προσαγορευομένους ἐνδύμενον εἰς τὰ σώματα τῶν προφητῶν ὑποφθέγγεσθαι τοῖς ἐκείνων στόμασι κτλ.

Ph. is quoted merely for the γυναῖκες ἑγγαστριμυθοὶ of whom he may have given particulars, perhaps even names <sup>1</sup>). No doubt he discussed them and the manner of their prophesying, as described by Plutarch.

It is doubtful whether he cited the elevated term *στερνόμαντις*, noted by the lexicographers <sup>2</sup>) from Tragedy, and it is improbable that he knew the later term *Πύθωνες*. He may have quoted Aristophanes, as he had to say something about the person and the time of the first representative of this kind of prophecy; but it would again be doubtful to assign to him the simple explanations in the Scholia on Aristophanes ('*Ἀθήνησι τάληθῃ μαντευόμενος διὰ τοῦ ἐνυπάρχοντος αὐτῷ δαίμονος*) and in the Scholia T on Plato *Soph.* 252 c (*Εὐρυκλῆς γὰρ ἐδόκει δαίμονά τινά ἐν τῇ γαστρὶ ἔχειν τὸν ἑρκελευόμενον αὐτῷ περὶ τῶν μελλόντων λέγειν*); they were perhaps developed by the Scholiasts from the parabasis *Vesp.* 1015 ff., and in regard to 'Ἀθήνησιν τάληθῃ this seems certain. In my opinion it is further quite uncertain whether there is any tradition behind the explanation ἐπὶ τῶν ἐπ' ὀλέθρῳ σφῶν αὐτῶν μαντευομένων . . . οὗτος δὲ προειπῶν ποτέ τινα τὰ μὴ καθ' ἡδονὴν ἀνηρέθη <sup>3</sup>); it looks more like an autoschediasm on the basis of Plato's words τὸ λεγόμενον οἰκοθεν τὸν πολέμιον καὶ ἐναντιωσόμενον ἔχοντες, ἐντὸς ὑποφθεγγόμενον ὡσπερ τὸν ἄτοπον Εὐρυκλέα περιφέροντες.

(79) Ph. has been quoted by Apollodoros, whose ten books *Περὶ Ἐπιχάρμου* collected the dispersed earlier research, continued it, and became authoritative for later authors <sup>1</sup>). Unfortunately the excerpt of Athenaios is corrupt and full of gaps. We cannot tell whether Ph. (who also wrote

a book about Alkman) discussed the whole literary legacy of Epicharmos, or only those of his works which somehow fell into the sphere of divination; but it is important that he treated *Kanon* and *Gnomai* in this connexion, as it shows the comprehensiveness of his conception of divination. We know 5 nothing about the *Kanon* <sup>2)</sup>, while about the *Gnomai* we see more clearly since a papyrus (dating from 280/40 B.C.; the whole collection need not have been much earlier) yielded the prooemium <sup>3)</sup>. Again we do not know either the time or the person of Axiopistos, and although we shall not doubt the evidence of Ph. for the statement that the collection carried 10 this author's name, one can hardly suppress the suspicion that it is a pseudonym.

(80-82) *Περὶ θουσιῶν* seems to have been a single book. If we can trust the form of its title as against *Περὶ τῶν Ἀθήνησι μνηῶν* and *Περὶ μυστηρίων τῶν Ἀθήνησιν* it was not confined to Athens (at least not on principle). But 15 the basis for inferences of that kind is not very solid, F 80 being the only certainly genuine fragment, and even concerning it one may doubt whether it dealt with the sacrificial offering of tongues generally, or only gave the explanation of an Attic custom, though some points seem to tell in favour of the former alternative. I should not like to use the first 20 of Conti's quotations for deciding the question; nor do F 171/2, 173, 178, 194 help, because for all of them not only the *Althis* but other special works as well are possible claimants <sup>1)</sup>. How far matters occurring in these were also mentioned in *Περὶ θουσιῶν*, and whether this book aimed at completeness, cannot be ascertained at all: the whole picture is much less 25 clear than that of *Περὶ μαντικῆς*. This may be explained by the fact that quite a number of books about sacrifices were published subsequently <sup>2)</sup>. Ph. was perhaps not the first to write *Περὶ θουσιῶν*: apart from his *Ἐπιτομὴ τῆς Διονυσίου πραγματείας περὶ ἱερῶν*, the contents of which are doubtful <sup>3)</sup>, there is the book by Demon <sup>4)</sup> which may well be earlier. In this case 30 we should like to know whether and in what manner the difference between the professional prophet and the 'Aristotelian' made itself felt.

(80) Schol. HMQR *Od.* γ 341 <sup>1)</sup> ἐζήτησαν διὰ τί τοῖς θεοῖς ἀπένεμον τὰς γλώσσας. οἱ μὲν ἐνόμισαν, ὧν ἔστι Λέανδρος (492 F 12) ἢ Ἀρητάδης <sup>2)</sup>, κατὰ πατρῶιον ἔθος Ἰώνων· ἔστι γὰρ πάτριον ἔθος Ἰώνων. Ἀπίων (616) 35 δὲ ὅτι κράτιστον τῶν μελῶν ἡ γλῶσσα, τὰ δὲ κράτιστα τοῖς θεοῖς ἀπένεμον. οἱ δὲ ὅτι δεῖ παύειν αὐτὴν εἰς κοίτην ἰόντας <sup>3)</sup>, ὅθεν καὶ τῷ Ἐρμῆι πυμάτῳ σπένδεσκον (ἡ 136/8) κτλ.; Schol. V γ 332 ἔθος ἦν (τοῖς Ἑλλησι Schol. E τοῖς παλαιοῖς Schol. Apoll. Rhod. I, 516/8 b) τρεπομένοις πρὸς τὸ καθεύδειν τῶν ἱερείων τὰς γλώσσας ἀποτέμνειν καὶ καίειν τοῖς θεοῖς

τοῖς λόγου ἐπιμελομένοις· διὸ καὶ ἐπὶ μόνῃς τῆς Νέστορος θυσίας εἴρηται τὸ ἔθος. εὐήθες γὰρ τὸ λέγειν πόνντεμε τοὺς λόγουςα. λέγεται δὲ Ἄττικὸν εἶναι τὸ ἔθος, λαβόντων (λαβὸν ν) τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐντεῦθεν.

The quotation of Ph. is preserved in the discussion of *Od.* γ 330/41 <sup>4</sup>) 5 (verses only partly intelligible to us), which we have before us in the Scholia on the passage (only partly printed here) and in the Scholia on *Apoll. Rhod.* ι, 516/8 <sup>5</sup>). The explanation takes two different courses: the historical one, where the interpreters furnish evidence for the sacrifice of tongues in the Greek world, and the theological or speculative one, <sup>10</sup> where they ask what was its sense, and also to what gods this sacrifice was offered. The latter (under Stoic influence) converges more and more exclusively on Hermes <sup>6</sup>); the former adduces the custom practised by the Ionians <sup>7</sup>) and in Megara <sup>8</sup>), but does not mention Athens. The assertion that the custom had its origin in Athens is therefore not quite intelligible; <sup>15</sup> it may be founded on the fact that the Athenians were counted as Ionians and that an inference was made from the latter to the former <sup>9</sup>). The answer of Ph., however, is distinctly speculative. Unfortunately the Scholiast has excerpted it so succinctly that we are merely able to state that Ph. had no part in the distortions (which, perhaps, he did not <sup>20</sup> even know) by means of which Stoic interpretation of Homer referred the passage of the *Odyssey* to Hermes. The grammarian Apion, when repeating Ph.'s opinion, says τοῖς θεοῖς. Accordingly one might assume that Ph. discussed the tongue-sacrifice quite generally, not on the occasion of some Attic cult. But even if he did mention a cult, Hermes, <sup>25</sup> as we may infer from the state of our knowledge, would have a poor claim <sup>10</sup>). There is but little evidence for the sacrifice of tongues in historical times <sup>11</sup>). The stoicizing grammarian Dioskorides of about 100 B.C. (594 F 5) <sup>12</sup>) assigns (for his own time) the last libation, not the sacrifice of the tongue, to Zeus Teleios, while Apollonios (for the heroic period) <sup>30</sup> connects the final libation to Zeus with the sacrifice of the tongue.

(81) This authority always rouses suspicion, and especially when a definition is concerned. Otherwise the one given here makes a rather favourable impression. If *cantilenae in sacris* means the hymn, which comes nearest to the general term 'song of cult', the definition sets out well enough its <sup>35</sup> two main functions—the encomium of the god and the prayer of man founded on it. But the fact that Proklos in his *Chrestomathy* (Phot. *Bibl.* 239 p. 320 a 9; 322 a 30) separates these two functions <sup>1</sup>) raises doubts as to whether that definition really belongs to Ph.: καὶ φησι τὸν ὕμνον μὲν ὠνομάσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑπόμνησίν τινα εἶναι καὶ οἰοῦναι εἰς μνήμην καὶ

ὑπόμνησιν ἀγειν τὰς πράξεις τῶν ὑμνουμένων, ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδειν αὐτάς, ὅπερ ἔστι λέγειν and εὐκτικὰ δὲ μέλη ἐγράφετο τοῖς αἰτουμένοις τι παρὰ θεοῦ γενέσθαι. This might be explained from the preceding, rather artificial, classification of lyrics into τὰ εἰς θεοῦς, τὰ εἰς ἀνθρώπους, τὰ εἰς θεοῦς καὶ 5 ἀνθρώπους, in which the εὐκτικὰ are counted in the third group <sup>2)</sup>, whereas the hymn is at the same time the comprehensive term for all μέλη εἰς θεοῦς. Neither the division into groups, nor the definition of each group would be impossible for the second half of the fourth century B.C.

(82) The nearest to this passage is Suda s.v. Οἰδίπους· ἡ λεγομένη 10 Σφιγξ . . . γυνὴ δυσειδῆς καὶ θηριώδης τὴν φύσιν· ἀποβαλοῦσα γὰρ τὸν ἄνδρα καὶ συναγαγοῦσα χεῖρα καὶ τόπον καταλαβοῦσα δύσβατον τοὺς παριόντας ἐφύεν. ὁ οὖν Οἰδίπους δεινὸν τι βουλευσάμενος δίδωσιν ἑαυτὸν μετ' αὐτῆς ληστεύειν· καὶ ἐπιτηρήσας καιρὸν ἐν ἠβούλετο λόγῃ ἀναρεῖ αὐτὴν καὶ τοὺς μετ' αὐτῆς. Malalas p. 51, 8 ff. ed. Bonn. <sup>1)</sup> gives the same record in a more 15 diffuse form. The rationalisation of the Sphinx is not at all late <sup>2)</sup>: in Palaiphatos Π. ἀπ. 4 <sup>3)</sup> she is the former wife of Kadmos; when he marries Harmonia she wages war with the Thebans, πείσας πολλοὺς τῶν πολιτῶν συναπᾶραι αὐτῇ, and is killed by Oidipus, ἀνὴρ Κορίνθιος τὰ τε πολεμικὰ ἀγαθός . . . καὶ λόχους τῶν Καδμείων ποιήσας . . . καὶ ἐνεδρεύσας αὐ- 20 τῇ. Another version in Pausan. 9, 26, 2 οἱ δὲ κατὰ ληιστείαν σὺν δυνάμει ναυτικῇ πλανωμένην φασὶν αὐτὴν ἐς τὴν πρὸς Ἀνθηδόνην σχεῖν θάλασσαν, καταλαβοῦσαν δὲ τὸ ὄρος τοῦτο ἀρπαγαῖς χρῆσθαι, πρὶν ἐξεῖλεν Οἰδίπους αὐτὴν ὑπερβόλεμος πλήθει στρατιᾶς, ἣν ἀφίκετο ἔχων ἐκ Κορίνθου. We cannot entirely 25 dispute the attribution to Ph. on account of the rationalizing <sup>4)</sup>, even less simply because the question is about a matter of history, not one of cult. It is, however, difficult to understand in what connexion such a story in such a form could have occurred in Περὶ θυσῶν <sup>5)</sup>. Possibly Conti made a deliberately wrong statement about the title. As to the matter, the participation of Athena, who is not mentioned in any of the other accounts, is 30 surprising. It would be difficult to regard this trait as an invention of Conti <sup>6)</sup>, although it does not seem to agree with the rationalisation of the story.

(83-84) The natural arrangement for this separate book is that of the calendars of sacrifices as preserved in inscriptions <sup>1)</sup>, and it is 35 quite conceivable that the single book Περὶ ἑορτῶν was merely such a calendar. This assumption seems corroborated by the fact that the two fragments expressly assigned to it furnish calendar dates. Any further attributions needs must remain uncertain, as F 83/4 are not given verbatim and as numerous festivals occurred in the *Atthis* <sup>2)</sup>, where at

least the more important were described in detail. Apart from the fact that the *Atthis* always had to start from the historical connexion, having thus presumably discussed the greater number of the festivals in the second book <sup>3</sup>), we do not know whether it treated them differently from <sup>5</sup> *Περὶ ἑορτῶν* on principle. Of fragments which one might be inclined to assign to this book only F 168 about the Genesia (which in itself might also have a historical connexion) gives a calendar date <sup>4</sup>). If F 183 on the Oschophoria also belonged to it (which is not at all certain) Ph. dealt with this festival not in the same way as in the *Atthis* <sup>5</sup>), and the possi-  
 10 bility that he sometimes changed his views in the course of a long life must always be considered; otherwise he probably used the earlier special books when writing his main work. Thus we do not know much about *Περὶ ἑορτῶν*: it is not even certain that, apart from the calendar date, Ph. gave the reasons for the institution of the individual festivals. But  
 15 if he considered private festivals at all, he must have added a distinctive term for state festivals <sup>6</sup>). Description cannot have been entirely lacking, but how far the work went into particulars remains doubtful, as it consisted of one book only.

(83) F 84 provides from *Περὶ ἑορτῶν* merely the calendar date of the <sup>20</sup> Chytroi. As in F 83 Ph. seems to be quoted twice, we can with certainty claim here, too, only the date for this book <sup>1</sup>). It shows that the Haloa was not a 'harvest thanksgiving' nor a 'festival of the threshing-floor'; its purpose was rather to 'protect the sprouting crop from noxious influences and promote its growth' <sup>2</sup>). The first quotation (if there are two) would  
 25 derive from the *Atthis* <sup>3</sup>); its nature is historical and aitiological, and in the distinct statement that 'people then lived in the country round about their threshing-floors' τότε refers to the time of the first king Kekrops, who settled men together in πόλεις for their protection <sup>4</sup>). The words τὰς διατριβάς ποιεῖσθαι περὶ τὰς ἄλως <sup>5</sup>), compared with ἐν τοῖς ἀγροῦς  
 30 δαιτιασθαι of Thukydides <sup>6</sup>), were chosen because Ph. is explaining the name of the festival which, at the same time, he uses as evidence of primeval conditions prevailing in Attica before the reign of Kekrops <sup>7</sup>). The etymology is found in more detail in two articles of the Synagoge <sup>8</sup>):  
 35 χαῖς <ταῖς> ἀπὸ τῆς ἄλω τότε καταχρήσασθαι φέροντας εἰς Ἐλευσίνα · ἢ ἐπεὶ ἐν ἄλωσιν ἐπαιζον ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ. ἤγετο δὲ ἐπὶ τῇ συγκομιδῇ τῶν καρπῶν. — ἑορτῇ 'Αλῶ<ι>α, ἐν ἧι καὶ Ποσειδῶνος πομπή. ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ συναλιζεσθαι <sup>9</sup>), ἐνθεν καὶ ἄλως. καὶ ἡλιαία δέ, ἐπεὶ πολλοὶ δικασταὶ συναθροίζονται. The second gloss gives Ph.'s view or its development by a later etymologist;

it has preserved an important trait of the festival, *viz.* the *πομπή* for Poseidon. This trait confirms what we should have to infer anyhow when deriving the first quotation from the *Atthis*: the Haloa as a festival of remembrance must have existed (theoretically) in every one of the twelve towns founded by Kekrops<sup>10</sup>), but in the *Atthis* Ph. thinks and speaks either generally about the whole of Attica or primarily about Kekropia, the first town of the twelve and the later Athens<sup>11</sup>).

There is another explanation besides that of Ph. in the first gloss of the Synagoge which Eustath. *Il.* I 530 p. 772, 25<sup>12</sup>) proves to derive from the Atticist Pausanias of Hadrianus' time. His source was probably heortological if we may judge from the valuable scholion on Lucian p. 279, 24 ff. R<sup>13</sup>), which belongs to this branch of the tradition and is the only one of our testimonies to describe the rites of the Haloa in detail, although onesidedly referring them to Dionysos<sup>14</sup>). This explanation is not dealing with the Athenian, but with the Eleusinian Haloa about which we are much better informed, and which in historical times obviously was the most important<sup>15</sup>). It calls the Haloa a festival of Demeter, (Kore), and Dionysos, and this is the foundation of the conception that the Haloa was a festival of the harvest or threshing-floor. This conception, which survived the refutation by Nilsson<sup>16</sup>), is by no means the only one in antiquity: Ph. for example does not share it; but we find it in the Atticist Pausanias and in the Synagoge (*ἤγετο δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς συγκομιδῆς τῶν καρπῶν* above p. 362, 36<sup>17</sup>)), and the *ἀπαρχαί* offered *ἀπὸ τῆς ἄλω εἰς Ἐλευσίνα* prove it to be early. On the other hand the Scholia on Lucian define *ἑορτὴ Ἀθήνησι μυστήρια περιέχουσα Δήμητρος καὶ Κόρης καὶ Διονύσου ἐπὶ τῆς τομῆς τῆς ἀμπέλου καὶ τῆς γεύσει τοῦ ἀποκειμένου ἤδη οἴνου γινόμενα*, and this definition brings us to the actual time of the Haloa in Poseideon<sup>18</sup>). No serious heortologist could indeed be believed capable of originally assigning the harvest to Poseideon, or the Haloa to all summer; but the festival had a history, and it was not the same in all demes, the Eleusinian policy for example being clear to some extent. There is also a case of actual confusion: an interpreter of Homer cited the Haloa<sup>19</sup>) on the passage *Θαλύσια γουνοῖ ἀλωῆς Il.* I 354, obviously because of the *ἀλωή*, and subsequently later writers identified the two festivals. Thus again the Haloa were made a harvest-festival, 'the same as the Thalsia'.

(84) No more belongs to Ph. than the date of the Chytroi quoted by Harpokration from *Περὶ ἑορτῶν*<sup>1</sup>); *b* is a mixture of various sources<sup>2</sup>). The date agrees with the tradition that the Chytroi was counted as the

third and last day of the Anthesteria. Concerning the whole festival see Schol. Thuc. (P. Ox. 853) p. 121, 20 Hude ἐπὶ τρεῖς μὲν ἐστὶν ἑορτὴ ἡμέρας ἰα, ἰβ, ἰγ, ἐπίσημός ἐστι δὲ ἡ ἰβ, [ὡς] εἶπεν αὐ[τός] and Schol. Aristoph. *Ach.* 961 = Harpokr. s.v. Χόες· φησὶ δ' Ἀπολλόδωρος <sup>3)</sup> Ἀνθεσθήρια καλεῖσθαι κοινῶς τὴν δὴν ἑορτὴν Διονύσῳ ἀγομένην, κατὰ μέρος δὲ Πιθοίγια, Χόας, Χύτρος. For the Πιθοίγια Plutarch mentions the eleventh <sup>4)</sup>, for the Χόες Harpokr. s.v. gives the twelfth Anthesterion <sup>5)</sup>. Real variants do not exist: in Schol. Aristoph. *Ach.* 961 <sup>6)</sup> the supplement <δω>δεκάτη is obvious; the second version of Schol. *Ach.* 1076 ἄλλως·

<sup>10</sup> ἐν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ ἄγονται οἱ τε Χύτροι καὶ οἱ Χόες ἐν Ἀθήναις, ἐν ζῆ <sup>7)</sup> πᾶν σπέρμα εἰς χύτρον ἐφήσαντες θύουσι μόνῳ τῷ [[Διονύσῳ καὶ]] Ἑρμῆι· οὕτω Δίδυμος is not a calendar date but an explanation (excessively abbreviated) of the lines ὑπὸ τοὺς Χοᾶς γὰρ καὶ Χύτρος αὐτοῖσι τις / ἤγγειλε ληιστάς ἐμβαλεῖν Βοιωτίους <sup>8)</sup>.

<sup>15</sup> What Ph. said about the festival is lost. That is regrettable, but even if it had been preserved it would hardly help to decide the modern problem whether *the* Anthesteria was (to use the rough terms) a 'spring festival' <sup>9)</sup> or a 'wine festival' <sup>10)</sup> or a 'festival of the souls' <sup>11)</sup>. Heortologically speaking: is the connexion between Πιθοίγια - Χόες on the one side, and Χύτροι on the other, original? Theologically speaking: is Dionysos 'lord of the souls' <sup>12)</sup> from the beginning and by his nature or did he obtain that quality 'only by being connected with the festival of souls' <sup>13)</sup>. It is impossible even to touch upon this problem here; we must strictly confine ourselves to the tradition which has come down from times when

<sup>25</sup> the connexion had been established, *i.e.* we must exclude even the question whether Anthesteria existed before and without Dionysos. The tradition is by no means simple or clear. Thukydides <sup>14)</sup> would help if we knew for certain that he had himself given the δωδεκάτη as the day of the Anthesteria which, according to him, was a common Ionian festival.

<sup>30</sup> For that would exclude the Chytra at least for Ionia and would thus lead straight to the simplest solution, *viz.* the coincidence of the two festivals in the calendar <sup>15)</sup>: the three days festival would be the result of the fact that the festival of the new god, who came from Ionia and to whom the twelfth day of the month <sup>16)</sup> was sacred everywhere, immediately pre-

<sup>35</sup> ceded the old festival of the dead, the Chytroi, in Athens and only in Athens <sup>17)</sup>. There are some other points indicating that the connexion between the Choes and the Chytroi was a loose one <sup>18)</sup>, and at first sight it almost seems as if it had been Apollodoros <sup>19)</sup> who united the different festivals under a collective name as a festival of Dionysos. But apart



from the possibly (or probably) ritual verse *Θύραζε Κήρες, οὐκέτ' Ἀνθεστήρια* (which, whatever its age may be, surely is earlier than Apollodoros<sup>20</sup>), such a suggestion would contradict the nature of Apollodoros' work which makes use of the facts of cult but does not invent them.

5 The lemma of Harpokration, who calls the *Χύτροι* an 'Attic festival' and who supplies the calendar date of that festival alone, is not in any way sufficient evidence for the assumption that the *Chytroi* was a festival by itself: the lexicographers frequently call even single ceremonies a festival (e.g. the *Buphonia* of the *Dipolieia*), and

10 Harpokration s.v. *Χόες* follows up the definition *ἐορτή τις ἦν παρ' Ἀθηναίοις ἀγομένη Ἀνθεστηριῶνος δωδεκάτη* by the quotation from Apollodoros, according to whom it is only one day of the *Anthesteria*. Moreover, hardly anybody has ever doubted that *Πιθολύγια* and *Χόες* belong together, consequently the term *ἐορτή* is certainly inaccurate here.

15 On the other hand, an early connexion of *Choes* and *Chytroi* seems to be indicated by the facts that (to phrase it neutrally and cautiously) the festival of the dead, the *Χύτροι*, has thrown its shadow on the preceding days of the *Anthesteria*, the *Anthesteria* in the narrower sense, and that conversely *Dionysos* also had, or had received, a share in the

20 *Chytroi*. In view of the chorus *Ran.* 215/9 and the *ἀγῶνες Χύτρινοι* there can be no doubt of the latter fact<sup>21</sup>), even if it merely yields a *terminus ante*; on the other hand, however, it is attested that on the day of the *Chytroi* sacrifices were offered *τῶν μὲν Ὀλυμπίων θεῶν οὐδενὶ τὸ παράπαν, Ἐρμῆι δὲ Χθονίῳ*<sup>22</sup>), and this, if it is true, would preclude an original

25 connexion of the *Anthesteria* with the *Chytroi*. The former fact is perhaps less clear: we have not a single reliable testimony for the assumption that the first two days were also meant for the dead, at least not so far as the cult is concerned. Also the evidence for *Choes* and even *Πιθολύγια* having been considered as *ἀποφράδες*, cannot exactly be called convincing<sup>23</sup>);

30 and if it is correct the reason may be a different one, not the walking of the dead. Even the tradition preserved by Phanodemos 325 F 11 that the sanctuaries were closed at the *Choes*, combined with the supplementary testimony in the speech *Περὶ Νεαίρας* § 76 that the sanctuary of *Dionysos* ἐν *Λίμναις* was opened once in the year only at the *Anthesteria*, would be

35 evidence only if we could ascertain previously that *Dionysos* (or at least this *Dionysos*) was lord of the souls. Else another explanation might be suggested, viz. the hostility of the older gods towards the intruder<sup>24</sup>), which should at least be considered, particularly in regard to the earliest Attic festival of *Dionysos*.

(85-88) The fragments of the special work *Περὶ ἡμερῶν*, which comprised at least two books, have been preserved in Proklos' commentary on Hesiod's *Erga* (F 88; 189-190) and in Photios' *Lexicon* (F 85-87). The former certainly took them from Plutarch's commentary <sup>1)</sup>, the latter from the *Synagoge*, which on its part probably has them ultimately from the Atticist Pausanias <sup>2)</sup>. The material may be increased from the *Scholia* on Hesiod with some certainty, for, so far as we can see, Ph. alone among the earlier authors wrote *Περὶ ἡμερῶν*; the author quoted in F 190 besides Ph. (certainly already by Plutarch) in regard to the days which τὰ πάτρια τῶν Ἀθηναίων καθαρμοῦς ἀποδίδωσι καὶ ἀποτροπαῖς may actually have been an exegetes (most probably Kleidemos <sup>3)</sup>). The most important fact we learn is that Ph. (as would be expected considering *Περὶ μαντικῆς*) treated the significance of the days systematically: *Schol. Orph. 763* contains remains of such a systematic treatment—

15 αἱ περὶ τῆς τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐκλογῆς καὶ ἀπεκλογῆς παλαιότητες ἔχουσι μὲν τὰς ἀρχὰς ἐκ τῶν παρατηρήσεων, ἄλλαι δὲ παρ' ἄλλοις ἐκράτησαν, ἐπεὶ καὶ παρ' Ὀρφεῖ τινὲς αὐτῶν διακρίσεις, καὶ ἐν τοῖς Ἀθηναίων πατρίοις διωρίσθησαν <sup>4)</sup>· καὶ αἱ μὲν ἀγαθαὶ τινες, αἱ δὲ φαῦλαι, μέσαι δὲ τινες εἶναι κτλ. <sup>5)</sup> — and Plutarch <sup>6)</sup> discussed a question of principle, of which we should like to know

20 whether it was already raised by Ph. (and if so, how he answered it): περὶ δ' ἡμερῶν ἀποφράδων εἶτε χρὴ τίθεσθαι τινὰς εἰτ' ὀρθῶς Ἡράκλειτος ἐπέπληξεν Ἡσιόδῳ τὰς μὲν ἀγαθὰς ποιουμένῳ τὰς δὲ φαύλας, ὡς ἀγνοοῦντι φύσιν ἡμέρας ἀπάσης μίαν οὔσαν, ἐτέρωθι διηπόρηται. Considering the fact that *Περὶ μαντικῆς* shows a particular interest of Ph. in Orpheus, and that he had

25 critical views on the authenticity of early mantic literature, we can hardly doubt that the numerous quotations in the *Scholia* from Orpheus' *Ἡμέραι ἢ Ἐφημερίδες* <sup>7)</sup> occurred already in Ph., who surely did not pass by Hesiod's *Ἔργα καὶ Ἡμέραι* and other early writers <sup>8)</sup>. The *μαντῆς*, convinced of the value of divination as he was, may also have set

30 forth his fundamental attitude in the question of the selection of days against Herakleitos and other antagonists of that 'superstition'. As to particulars, not much can be obtained; but in *Schol. Hesiod. Orph. 780* we actually seem to have a fragment of Ph.: διὸ καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι τὰς πρὸς σύνοδον ἡμέρας ἐξελέγοντο πρὸς γάμους, καὶ τὰ Θεογάμια ἐτέλουν, τότε φυσικῶς εἶναι

35 πρῶτον οἰόμενοι γάμον τῆς σελήνης οὔσης πρὸς ἡλίου σύνοδον. Also the assignment of the eighth day of the month to Poseidon in *Schol. 788* <sup>9)</sup> may derive from him.

The systematic introduction was probably contained in the first book, which moreover seems to have generally discussed the significance of

numbers in themselves. How far Ph. dealt in speculations about numbers cannot be said <sup>10</sup>), but F 85, the only fragment attested for book I, is evidence for his conviction that the day of birth determined the character and the life of men. That is by no means astrology, for it is not the constellation of the day in the year that is decisive, but the 'saint' of the day <sup>5</sup> in the month. The resemblance of the formulation *ὁ τετράδι γεννώμενοι κτλ.* with astrological predictions will not lead anybody astray: the doctrine of Ph. is the earlier one in Hellas, and it probably represents a wide-spread popular belief <sup>11</sup>). For the second book there would remain <sup>10</sup> the enumeration and discussion of the single days in the sequence of their position in the calendar, which return in each month and have the same significance, sacred and otherwise, in each <sup>12</sup>). F 86 supplies the form: *ἕξ ἐπὶ δέκα* in the title <sup>13</sup>) and *ταύτη τῆς ἡμέραι* in the preserved portion of the treatise correspond with the formula *ἄρχων ὁ δεῖνα ἐπὶ τούτου* <sup>15</sup> used in the *Atthis* for defining the year. The alteration to *ἕκτι ἐπὶ δέκα* <sup>14</sup>), the assumption that 'the names of the months were the main titles, followed by the statements about the several days as subtitles', the comparison with the sacrificial calendars dependent on the 'ecclesiastical year', are misleading. This is the arrangement rather of books *Περὶ μηνῶν* <sup>20</sup> which are sometimes entitled *Περὶ ἐορτῶν καὶ μηνῶν* and in which the festivals of the year form the principle theme <sup>15</sup>). It is of little importance whether these annual festivals (with which Ph. dealt in a special work: F 83/4) were mentioned in *Περὶ ἡμερῶν* too; this would be conceivable and quite possible formally <sup>16</sup>). Nor is it of primary importance whether <sup>25</sup> historical events were noted under their respective days as we might suppose in view of Plutarch. *Camill.* 19 <sup>17</sup>). The essential fact is that books *Περὶ ἡμερῶν* ever since 'Hesiod' and 'Orpheus' had been arranged according to the days of the month, not of the year, and that their contents correspondingly differed from those of works *Περὶ μηνῶν* <sup>18</sup>). The few <sup>30</sup> fragments we have probably show us one side of the contents only, that which we may comprehensively call the sacred side: the note on each day states to what god the day is sacred (F 85; 87; 88; 189), or in what its sacred significance consists (F 190), why it is sacred <sup>19</sup>), and what is due to the god on that day in the way of sacred observances (F 86). That regarding the last point the *πάτρια Ἀθηναίων* were of primary importance for <sup>35</sup> Ph. may be assumed forthwith; but that he confined himself to Athens seems out of the question both because of his quite general characterisation of the gods in F 85; 87; (88), and because of his consideration of the poetical *Ἡμέραι* and the Pythagorean doctrine of numbers. It is con-

ceivable that only the first book had this comparatively general character, and that the calendar proper took Athens alone into account; in any case, no vestiges of a reference to a calendar of festivals outside Athens occur in the fragments not assigned to a certain book <sup>20</sup>). In regard to the  
 5 human aspect we saw that (in the first book) the significance of the birthday for the nature and the character was stated. What is altogether lacking in the fragments, although this must surely have been treated, is the main topic of the old poetical 'Hμέραι: the selection of days, αὐτῆς τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐκλογῆς καὶ ἀπεκλογῆς παραινέσεις, the significance of each  
 10 day for actions to be undertaken by men, the difference of favourable and unfavourable days.

(85) Zenob. *Prov.* 6, 7 (Ath. 2, 78 Mi) τετράδι γέγονας· παροιμία. τὸν 'Ηρακλέα γάρ φασι τετράδι γεννηθῆναι, καὶ ἔνδοξον ὄντα καὶ ἐπιφανέστατον ἀλλοί ταιλαιπυρεῖν· ἔστιν οὖν ἡ παροιμία ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλοις πονουμένων. μέμνηται ταύτης Πλάτων ὁ κωμικὸς ἐν Πεισάνδρῳ. φασι δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ τετράδι θεὸν νομισθῆναι. Eustath. *Il.* Ω 336 (see below); *Od.* ε 262 p. 1534, 31 δοκεῖ γὰρ ἡ τετράς ἔχειν τι βαρύτητος, ὡς ἡ κατὰ τὸν 'Ηρακλέα ἱστορία δηλοῖ, ὅς ἡμέραι τετάρτη γεννηθεὶς δυστυχῆς ἀπέβη, ὅθεν καὶ παροιμία τὸ 'Τετράδι γέγονα' κτλ. Suda s.v. τετραδισταί· οἱ ἐπίπονον βίον διάγοντες, ἀπὸ τοῦ 'Ηρακλέους, ὅς τετράδι γεννηθεὶς πολλοὺς πόνους ἔτλη. In order to establish which portion of F 85 is actually Ph., we have to distinguish between the simple explanation of the proverb and a discussion, evidently circumstantial, of the significance in cult of the fourth day of the month with speculations about the number four <sup>1</sup>). Remains of this discussion which, in view of their nature, may be  
 25 assumed mainly to derive from a book *Περὶ ἡμερῶν*, are found in the following passages: (1) Schol. Aristoph. *Plut.* 1126 ἡ τετράς ἐνομιζέτο τοῦ 'Ερμού· καὶ καθ' ἕκαστον μῆνα ταύτη τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἀπετίθετο τῷ 'Ερμῆι (R; καθ' ἕ. μῆνα ἡμέρα ἀπετίθετο V; πλακοῦς ἀπετίθετο οἱ πλακοῦντα ἀπέθετο Ddf). — Ἐξω τῶν ἑορτῶν ἱεραὶ τινες τοῦ μηνὸς ἡμέραι νομίζονται 'Αθήνησι θεοῖς τισίν, οἷον  
 30 νομηγία καὶ ἐβδόμη 'Απόλλωνι, τετράς 'Ερμῆι, καὶ ὀγδόη Ἐθρσεῖ (Χάρισι γ' add. V v. 1128). (2) Schol. Prokl. Hesiod. *Ὀρῶν*. 798 ἡ τετάρτη ἱερά 'Αφροδίτης καὶ 'Ερμού, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πρὸς συνουσίαν ἐπιτηδεῖα <sup>2</sup>). (3) Schol. Eustath. *Il.* Ω 336 σημειῶσαι δὲ ὅτι οὐ μόνον διὰ τὸ κατ' ἐπιστήμας τεταμερῆς τῆς φιλοσοφίας τέσσαρες τῷ . . . 'Ερμῆι κατὰ τὸν πάλαι μῦθον προσ-  
 35 πλάττονται κεφαλαί, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τὸ ἄλλως πολυδύναμον . . . ἀνάκειται δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ ὡς δίχα φύγου (φασί) τετραγώνου ἡ τετράς ἄλλον τρόπον ἤπερ τῷ 'Ηρακλεῖ, ἔξ οὗ παροιμία τὸ 'ἐν τετράδι γέγονας', ἤγουν ἐν ἀποφράδι ἡμέραι, ἐπεὶ καὶ 'Ηρακλῆς ἐν ταύτῃ γεννηθεὶς κακὸν διήθλει βίον. δηλοῖ δὲ τὰ κατὰ τὸν 'Ερμῆν καὶ ὁ γράψας <sup>2a</sup>) οὕτω ῥητῶς α' Ἐρμῆς τετρακέφαλος ἐν Κερα-

μεικῶι, Τελεσαρχίδου ἔργον, ζωῖ ἐπεγέγραπτο « Ἐρμῆ τετρακέφαλε, καλὸν Τελεσαρχίδου ἔργον, πάνθ' ὀράας ». « καὶ ἡ τετράς » δέ φησὶν « ἰερά τοῦ θεοῦ ». What is surprising is the subordinate part of Herakles: he is brought in by Eustathios only, and only because of the proverb. Eustathios himself  
 5 felt the contradiction which may be more accurately formulated by stating that the same day is said to be favourable for marriage, and unfavourable for those born on it <sup>3</sup>). Let us add the facts of cult: Hermes is the god of the fourth day since the story of his birth in the Homeric hymn <sup>4</sup>); for the connexion of Aphrodite both with Hermes and with  
 10 the fourth day of the month, too, evidence is good and abundant <sup>5</sup>). About Herakles we are informed by the proverb alone <sup>6</sup>), and here we have the variant that the paroemiographers simply mention his birth <sup>7</sup>), whereas Ph. states that the day was transferred to Herakles <sup>8</sup>). Διατεθεῖσθαι κτλ. can have no other meaning, and the statement may imply  
 15 the idea of a friendly agreement like e.g. the one between Apollo and Hermes <sup>9</sup>); for such an agreement (as for the conferring of the τιμαί) the entrance into Olympos is the suitable occasion, and the clause ἐν ταύτῃ εἰς θεοὺς μεταστάντι gives the reason for the διατεθεῖσθαι. It is for these matters that Ph. is quoted expressly in F 85 b <sup>10</sup>) while it  
 20 is at least uncertain whether he is also quoted for the birthday of Herakles: in F 85a line 26 the readings of the editors fluctuate between φησί and φασί, and in 85b the fact is given before the quotation from Ph. F 85a has preserved the number of the book, and Schol. Hesiod. *Op̄p.* 790 ἄριστος δὲ καὶ πολυίστωρ ὁ ἐν ταύτῃ (*scil.* εἰκάδι) τικτόμενος  
 25 furnishes a parallel to the contents. We must assume that Ph. fully discussed the questions connected with the fourth, and that he found for the conflict of conceptions the solution that the original lord of the day yielded a share to the young god <sup>11</sup>), thus adding a new significance to the day. Of all this only the fact ἡ δὲ Ἡρακλέους καὶ Ἐρμοῦ ἐστὶν has  
 30 remained in F 88, representing a different combination from that mentioned in Schol. *Op̄p.* 798 (above p. 368, 31/2). We do not know whether Ph. when discussing these matters made use of the theories about parts of the day <sup>12</sup>), and whether it was Herakles' hard life (although it ended in apotheosis) which stamped the day as being an unfavourable one.  
 35 (86) Et. gen. p. 37 Reῖ ἀμφιῶν · εἶδος πλακοῦντος τελούμενον τῇ Ἄρτεμιδι, οἶον ἠαστούς, τροφαλίδας, ἀμφιῶντας, ἰτρία « (III 513, 585 K) · διὰ τὸ <κύκλωι> φωτίζεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν δαίδων · ἢ διὰ τὸ πανσελήνου οὔσης πέμπεσθαι τῇ Ἐκάτῃ, <ἀμφιῶντος τότε ὄντος> τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. Μεθόδιος. Hesych. s.v. ἀμφιῶν · πλακοῦς ποιὸς Ἄρτεμιδι μετὰ δαίδων προσφερόμενος. Suda s.v. Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.)

- ἀμφιφῶντες (cf. Pausan. Attic. F 51 Schw); s. v. ἀνάστατοι . . . οἱ δὲ ἀμφιφῶντες γίνονται Μουνυχιῶνος μηνὸς ζ' ἐπὶ δέκα, οἱ καὶ εἰς τὸ Μουνυχίας ἱερὸν τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος κομίζονται. ὀνομάζονται δὲ ἀμφιφῶντες, ὡς μὲν τινες ἔτι τότε γίνονται ὅτε ἡλιός τε καὶ σελήνη πρῶτὴ ὑπὲρ γῆς φαίνονται, ὡς δὲ
- 5 Ἀπολλόδορος (244 F 152) ὅτι κομίζουσιν αὐτοὺς δάιδια ἡμένα παραπηγνύ-  
τες ἐπ' αὐτῶν. Pollux 6, 75 ἀμφιφῶντες μὲν οὖς ἔφερον εἰς Μουνυχίας Ἀρτέμι-  
δος, δάιδας ἡμένας περιπήξαντες. Before the passage of Photios became  
known F 86 was assigned, comprehensibly enough, to Περὶ θυσιῶν (F  
80/2). As a matter of fact we have here two notes about the word ἀμ-  
10 φῶν: (1) from the treatment of the sixteenth day of the month in  
Περὶ ἡμερῶν (which the lexicographer excerpted verbatim and Athenaios  
converted into indirect speech), taken from a common source, the *Sym-  
posion* of Herodianos <sup>1</sup>). It is merely one of many statements of Ph.  
about the sixteenth day of the month <sup>2</sup>). (2) a piece from a description  
15 of the πομπή <sup>3</sup>) of the sixteenth of Munychion for Artemis Munychia,  
which has its proper place in a book Περὶ ἐορτῶν <sup>4</sup>). This description,  
excerpted succinctly by Pollux and more fully in the Suda, derives from  
the Atticist Pausanias and probably ultimately from Apollodoros' Περὶ  
θεῶν, who rejected Ph.'s explanation of the word and substituted his own.
- 20 These are two different matters which must be kept apart. Whether or  
not the custom of the sixteenth day of the month is a 'private cult' <sup>5</sup>),  
Ph. in Περὶ ἡμερῶν discussed the sixteenth day of the month, whereas the  
book Περὶ ἐορτῶν (no matter whether it was that of Ph. or of somebody  
else) discussed the festival of the sixteenth of Munychion. The sense is  
25 quite clear in both cases: on this day of the month, the 16th, ἀμφιφῶντες  
are taken 'also' (i.e. besides other celebrations or whatever was said  
about the day <sup>6</sup>)) to Artemis' sanctuaries and to the cross-roads; on the  
sixteenth of Munychion there is a πομπή to the sanctuary of Artemis  
Munychia in which ἀμφιφῶντες are 'also' carried. General opinion when  
30 asserting that 'not on the sixteenth day of each month, but only on the  
ἕκτῃ ἐπὶ δέκα of Munychion the sacrifice of the ἀμφιφῶντες was offered' <sup>7</sup>)  
contradicts the tradition. For the name of the cake two explanations  
exist which correspond with the two meanings of ἀμφί, 'on both sides'  
and 'around', the former starting from the aition, the latter from the  
35 matter. The first explanation belongs to Ph. who (very suitably in a  
book about the days of the month) found in the ἀμφιφῶν a representation  
of the conjunction of sun and moon and therefore etymologized the word  
as 'double light' <sup>8</sup>); the second belongs to Apollodoros who from the  
aspect of the cake explained the word as 'shining round about' <sup>9</sup>).

(87) From the same source Suda s.v. τρίτου κρατήρος· τοῦ Σωτήρος, ὃν καὶ Τέλειον ἔλεγον. See further Hesych. s.v. τρίτος κρατήρ; Schol. Prokl. *Opp.* 809 τοῦ πρώτου τελείου τοῦ ᾧ, ἀρχὴν καὶ μέσσην καὶ τελευταίην ἔχοντας; Schol. Pindar. *Isthm.* 6, 10α τὸν δὲ τρίτον κρατήρα Διὸς Σωτήρος ἔλεγον, 5 καθὰ καὶ Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Ναυπλίῳ (F 92) »Ζεῦ παυσίλυπε, καὶ Διὸς Σωτηρίου/σπονδῆ τρίτου κρατήρος«. τὸν μὲν γὰρ πρώτον Διὸς Ὀλυμπίου ἐκίρνασαν, τὸν δὲ δεῦτερον Ἡρώων, τὸν δὲ τρίτον Διὸς Σωτήρος, καθὰ καὶ Αἰσχύλος ἐν Ἐπιγόνοις (F 55)· »λοιβάς Διὸς μὲν πρώτων ὠραίου γάμου / Ἦρας τε«, εἶτα »τὴν δευτέραν γε κρᾶσιν Ἡρωσιν νέμω«, εἶτα »τρίτον Διὸς Σωτήρος εὐκταίαν λίβα«. 10 Διὸς δὲ Σωτήρος ἔλεγον τὸν τρίτον διὰ τὸ τοὺς τοῦτον πίνοντας σταθεροὺς γίνεσθαι, τοὺς δὲ μετὰ τοῦτον εἰς ἄτην καὶ ἀνομίαν καὶ ἀσέλγειαν τρέπεσθαι· ἔλεγον δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ Τέλειον διὰ τὸ τέλειον εἶναι τὸν τρίτον ἀριθμὸν ἀρχὴν ἔχοντα καὶ μέσον καὶ τέλος; Schol. Plat. *Phileb.* p. 66 D ἔλεγον δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ Τέλειον, ὡς Εὐριπίδης Ἀνδρομέδαι (F 148) καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης Ταγηνισταῖς 15 (I 525, 526 K); Schol. Plat. *Charm.* p. 167 A τὸ τρίτον τῶν Σωτήρι ἐπὶ τῶν τελείως τι πραττόντων; Athen. 1, 28 p. 16 B (Dioskurides) ἔσπευον δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν δειπνῶν ἀναλύοντες, καὶ τὰς σπονδὰς ἐποιούντο Ἐρμῆι καὶ οὐχ ὡς ὕστερον Διὶ Τελείῳ. The fragment comes from a discussion on the number Three which may have been the opening of a section (in the first book?). 20 Ph. was not the first to give the definition; it may be Pythagorean <sup>1</sup>). The article of Photios is severely abbreviated, and we cannot maintain that either Ph. or Euripides or Aristophanes equated Zeus Soter and Zeus Teleios <sup>2</sup>). If they did the equation was the result of theological speculation, for in cult Zeus Soter and Zeus Teleios are distinct in Athens 25 and elsewhere <sup>3</sup>). Probably here, too, we have only the remains of a full discussion, for the tradition about the number, the sequence, and the recipients of the official libations at symposia shows wide differences <sup>4</sup>). Ph. himself seems to have given a different account in the *Atthis* (F 5b). The best explanation of this fact would be that in the *Atthis*, where he 30 was concerned with the aitia of certain cults, he simply mentioned the (third) libation for Zeus Soter, the reason he gives for it evidently being the same which is also known to the Scholiast on Pindar <sup>5</sup>); in *Περὶ ἡμερῶν*, however, where the significance of the number Three had to be treated, he started from Teleios and discussed the discrepancies of the tradition 35 about the recipient of the τρίτος κρατήρ. That the third day of the month is sacred to Zeus is not stated.

(88) This is not one quotation but a bundle of notes on the three days of the month which Hesiod mentioned in the first place: the first <sup>1</sup>), the fourth, and the seventh. Only the first is quoted as Ph.; but the second,

clumsily abridged though it is, is guaranteed as his by F 85 <sup>2)</sup>); and the seventh day of the month is so generally held to be the birthday of Apollo <sup>3)</sup> that we may also claim it for Ph., the more so as Schol. Prokl. *Opp.* 767 refer to the Athenian calendar: διὸ καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι ταύτην (*scil.* 5 τὴν ἑβδόμην) ὡς Ἀπολλωνιακὴν τιμῶσι δαφνηφοροῦντες, καὶ τὸ κανοῦν ἴαποστρέφοντες καὶ ὕμνοῦντες τὸν θεόν. Αὐτὴν lin. 21 refers to ἔνη only and is confirmed by νεομηνία, Νεομήνιος in **b**. As the lord of the ἔνη **b** mentions Apollo only <sup>4)</sup>, **a** gives it to Apollo and Helios. But although the Scholion on Aristoph. *Plut.* 1126 (quoted above p. 368, 26 ff.) says 10 νεομηνία καὶ ἑβδόμη Ἀπόλλωνος (*scil.* ἱερά), Proklos is the better witness. Only we do not see in this case, as we do in F 85, how Ph. determined the relation between the two gods. It is quite possible that he identified them as he did Artemis with Selene <sup>5)</sup>, though then we should expect Ἥλιου <τοῦ> καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος. In the whole of the earlier evidence concerning the 15 cult Helios provides difficulties <sup>6)</sup>, and we can hardly interpret the Scholion as meaning that, although the seventh was the birthday of Apollo, he also ruled over the first as Apollo-Helios, as Artemis did over the sixteenth (in her quality as Hekate?). On the other hand **b** (where the reference to the Ἀθηναῖοι may simply have dropped out) mentions 20 Neomenios; Schol. Aristoph. *l.c.* also gives Apollo the first day of the month; and Proklos (on *Opp.* 767) mentions a ceremony in Athens on that day which we know in other places as well <sup>7)</sup>. In fact, not enough has been preserved of Ph.'s treatment of the first day of the month, and we can therefore not reach a clear decision.

25 (89) Schol. Aristoph. *Ach.* 813 τροπαλλίς δὲ ἡ δέσμη τῶν σκορόδων. Hesych. s.v. τριτόπηλις (and τριόπηλις)· σκορόδων δέσμη, ἀπὸ τοῦ πεπι- λῆσθαι καὶ συνεστράφθαι. The Mss. tradition leads to Σκίρα, not to the καιροί of a festival mentioned previously. Abstinence from sexual intercourse agrees with that festival which largely belongs to Demeter 30 and to women <sup>1)</sup>. The statement about the eating of garlic must, of course, not be doubted <sup>2)</sup>; but, equally of course, we are not committed to Ph. in regard to the explanation. He obviously 'merely reflects the views of his time' <sup>3)</sup> and, with the simple-mindedness typical of the rationalist, he ascribed to the ancients the keen sense of smell which the civilized 35 Athenian possessed <sup>4)</sup>. Alypos is unknown <sup>5)</sup>, and the name (like Alypios, Alypetos) is not restricted to Athens. We know an Ἀρχῖνος Ἀλυπῆτου Σκαμβωνίδης from the second half of the fourth century B.C. who, together with his mother Menekrateia, priestess of Aphrodite Pandemos, made a large dedication to that goddess <sup>6)</sup>. Alypos may quite



well belong to that family, if he was an Athenian, but that does not enable us to date the letter with any accuracy. The *πρός* in the title need not imply that it was controversial, unless one supposes that Alypos also was a writer, and this, of course, would not be impossible <sup>7</sup>). Anyhow, 5 F 89 does not look like an 'expert's opinion on questions regarding sacrifices' <sup>8</sup>); it explains in a certain manner a custom of cult, for which other (mystic?) explanations may have existed. About what in particular Ph. informed Alypos, or with what their controversy was concerned, we do not know; but scholars used to write letters about special questions 10 which did not deserve the honour of a book. It is possible that the question simply was about the passage of Aristophanes <sup>9</sup>) where alone the word seems to have occurred; it would be in accordance with the nature of learned letters if, starting from the passage of the poet, Ph. incidentally discussed the use of garlic in the life and cult of Athens.

15 (Nos. 14-18) Of this series of books, the contents of which would be of the greatest importance, all but the titles are lost. Judging from these <sup>2</sup>) (their form is not a reliable guide, but we have no other) *Περί ἀγώνων* and *Περί μυστηρίων* (like presumably *Περί ἑορτῶν*) treat particular sides of Athenian cult whereas *Περί καθαρμῶν*, *Περί ἱερῶν* (?) <sup>3</sup>), *Περί δει-* 20 *ρῶν* | are more comprehensive and, being systematic, might be compared with *Περί μαντικῆς*, *Περί ἡμερῶν* (and *Περί θυσιῶν*?). One can easily see why Ph. treated certain domains of subject-matter generally, restricting himself to Athens in others.

(No. 14) *Περί τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἀγώνων*] Agones are essential elements of 25 festivals and have to be viewed on the one side in their relation to cult, on the other in that to history (or technique). To the former belong the reason for the agon and its institution <sup>4</sup>), the recipient god, the customs observed in the performance <sup>5</sup>); to the latter the nature of the agones (whether *γυμνακοί*, *ἵππικοί*, *μουσικοί*) and the various events, their changes 30 (increasing or lessening) in the course of time, the lists of the victors. If F 171 derives from this book Ph. described in detail what belonged to cult (for the distributions enumerated of wine *etc.*, are required by the cult), and this is what we should expect *a priori*. Whether he treated the history with the same fulness we do not see; nor do we know which 35 festivals he discussed <sup>6</sup>). Even if he gave the lists of the victors (which is not certain, nor probable in my opinion <sup>6</sup>) a work of that kind, especially one concerned with Athens only, cannot have consisted of 17 books: this number in the catalogue of T 1 is that of the *Atthis*, which was repeated by the mistake of a scribe <sup>7</sup>). Of the special works similar in

kind *Περὶ ἑορτῶν*, *Περὶ μυστηρίων*, *Περὶ καθαρμῶν*, and *Περὶ θυσιῶν* seem to have been single books; *Περὶ ἡμερῶν* presumably had two, *Περὶ μαντικῆς* four (which is easily comprehensible). More than two books are hardly conceivable even for *Περὶ ἀγώνων*, a single book is more likely. This special work of the Athenian local historian, which in all probability dealt mainly with matters of cult, must be clearly distinguished from the 'peripatetic' literature about ἀγῶνες generally, which seems to have had an antiquarian character. Even the first of this series, Duris' one (?) book *Περὶ ἀγώνων*<sup>8)</sup>, was probably later than the work of Ph. This is certain with regard to Kallimachos' *Περὶ ἀγώνων*<sup>9)</sup> and the special books of Istros *Περὶ τῶν Ἡλίου ἀγώνων* and *Περὶ ἰδιότητος ἔθλων*<sup>10)</sup>.

(No. 15) *Ἐπιτομὴ τῆς Διονυσίου πραγματείας Περὶ ἱερῶν*. This certainly is one title<sup>11)</sup>, for a mere *Πραγματεία* would not be a title. The term *ἱερά* most likely means 'sanctuaries', and if the title is complete it does not mean merely Athenian ones. But it would be possible that *ἱερά* has quite a general meaning (as for instance in the definition of the exegetai as ἐξηγούμενοι τὰ ἱερά<sup>12)</sup>), or quite a special one, *i.e.* that it refers to the rules of divination from sacrifices. Ph. was himself a *ἱεροσκόπος*<sup>13)</sup>, and a special work about the rules of his own art (destined for practical use by, or enlightenment of, a greater public?) would be conceivable even besides the four books of the more systematical (and historical) work *Περὶ μαντικῆς*. In any case, the book of Dionysios must have been fairly voluminous and cannot have been unimportant if Ph. was satisfied to epitomize it. The fact in itself is surprising at so early a time<sup>14)</sup>, and we should like to know who this Dionysios was. But as it is not even certain that he was an Athenian and as he bears a very common name it would be hopeless to look for a definite author<sup>15)</sup>. It is instructive that such a work could disappear without leaving more than this faint vestige. In view of the tendency to doubt all unique citations and facts it may be pointed out that we know of Melanthios' *Atthis*, too, only by one chance citation, and that matters are not much better concerning that of Demon<sup>16)</sup>.

(No. 16) *Περὶ μυστηρίων τῶν Ἀθήνησιν* [*That μυστήρια*, even in Athens, does not mean only the Eleusinian cult is a well-known fact. Quite a number of celebrations are called *μυστήρια* or are characterized as *μυστηριώδεις*, *e.g.* the Skira and Buphonia (?)<sup>17)</sup>, the cults of Artemis Brauronia<sup>18)</sup> and of Aphrodite Koliai<sup>19)</sup>; we hear about mysteries at Halimus<sup>20)</sup> and at Korydalos<sup>21)</sup>, and there may have been more. We are informed to a certain extent only about the mysteries at Agrai which, after Athens and Eleusis had been united, became under the name of 'Little

Mysteries' a previous stage of the Eleusinia <sup>22</sup>), and about those of the Lykomids in Phlya which pertained to the cult of the Μεγάλη θεός and which claimed to be older than the Eleusinia <sup>23</sup>). It is hardly to be assumed that Ph. wholly omitted these latter because Melanthios had written a special book about them.

(No. 17) Περὶ καθαρμῶν] We may suppose that this was a technical book designed like e.g. Kleidemos' Ἐξηγητικόν <sup>24</sup>), although actions of, or rather rules for, expiation do not really belong to the sphere of functions of the μάντις. But a systematic treatment of actions and means of expiation would be conceivable as well <sup>25</sup>). The title does not enable us to reach a more definite conclusion; there existed (besides the famous book of Empedokles <sup>26</sup>) which, however, may have been differently conceived on the whole) a number of epic Καθαρμοὶ of doubtful date and authenticity: Καθαρμοὶ of Musaios are mentioned in F 208, but it is not quite certain whether the titles there derive from Ph.

(No. 18) Περὶ δειρίων (?) Concerning literature about dreams see on T 7 <sup>27</sup>). It remains as uncertain as in regard to the oracles <sup>28</sup>) whether we may assume an independent work (as we should like to do according to the evidence), or whether divination from dreams was discussed in the work Περὶ μαντικῆς.

(No. 19) The loss of Ἐπιγράμματα Ἀττικά, which calls to mind Krateros' Ψηφίσματα, is particularly regrettable. It surely was a separate collection, not an excerpt from the *Atthis*, in which inscriptions were frequently quoted <sup>1</sup>). We simply cannot tell whether Ph. collected them because of their historical (or cultic) importance only, or because of their antiquity. In any case, we must not consider only, or even primarily, poetical epigrams because (according to T 6) Ph. collected ἔμμετροι μαντεῖαι. But C. Mueller's conjecture that the main contents were 'tituli publici, pedestri plerique oratione scripti' goes beyond what we know in the opposite direction. Other suggestions, as for instance that Ph. collected 'Thebaicas et aliarum civitatum inscriptiones' <sup>2</sup>) and Daub's proposal to delete Ἀττικά in the title, lack sense.

(Nos. 20-23) These titles belong together because they all refer to tragic poetry and tragic poets. With these books we enter a new domain. Such researches into tragic poetry are neither required from, nor a matter of course for, the Atthidographer or the writer about matters of cult, and as far as we know not one of the Atthidographers wrote books on these, or similar, subjects. What is more, Ph. wrote on Tragedy not because he was an Athenian, for he wrote about Alkman and about the

Pythagorean women as well: his interest in all these subjects distinctly shows the scholar <sup>1</sup>). It is very regrettable that we are not able to determine with certainty the period of his life in which he wrote these books, but one should guard against finding here the influence of the peripatetic school <sup>2</sup>). When at some future time the history of scholarship in the fourth century B.C. will be written that influence may have to be restricted within much narrower limits. In any case, neither Philology in the narrower or in the wider sense of the word, nor the theory of poetry has its origin in the school of Aristotle. The idea of forming the mind by reading and interpreting the poets belongs to other and earlier scholars. These in a period very conscious of itself not only rendered account to themselves of the nature, the conditions, and the effect of poetry apart from, and before the beginning of, the lectures of Aristotle; they began to conceive the individuality of the poets and to interpret their works.

Herakleides of Pontos is not a Peripatetic; Aristoxenos and Dikaiarchos are so only *cum grano*. What the school contributed towards the new science is, when seen as a whole, much more in the historical than in the philological line; even its historical contributions are not wholly original, they continue in the old grooves. Asklepiades of Tragilos (no. 12), who was the first to discuss the subject-matter of tragic poetry (perhaps more as a historian than as a 'grammarian', both terms applied in the ordinary sense) and to whom, or against whom, Ph. wrote <sup>3</sup>), comes from the school of Isokrates. If Ph. wrote about the myths of Sophokles and if there existed 'Υποθέσεις τῶν Εὐριπίδου καὶ Σοφοκλέους μύθων by Dikaiarchos <sup>4</sup>), it is mere prejudice to infer <sup>5</sup>) (it cannot be proved anyhow) that the former 'continued' the latter.

It is hardly possible to state anything definite about any of the four books on the basis of only two fragments. No words should be wasted upon the mistaken identification <sup>6</sup>) of Περὶ τραγωιδιῶν with the Πρὸς Ἀσκληπιάδην ἐπιστολή: the fact that F 90 and F 91 both treat of Hekabe is almost a direct proof against this supposition, and anyhow, very strong positive reasons would be required for identifying a book of the Περὶ-type with a (polemical?) letter. F 90 is well in accord with the Περὶ-type, which treats mostly factual questions in the sequence given by the text. Ph. can hardly have discussed a great many points, for σύγγραμμα probably implies a single book. Aristotle, though he wrote a single book Περὶ τραγωιδιῶν as well (it certainly was not systematic as to its nature), prefers the earlier form, that of the Ἀπορήματα (Προβλήματα), which probably was not bound to the sequence of the text; with the exception of the

ten (?) books of Προβλήματα Ὀμηρικά, his Ἀπορήματα Ἡσιόδου, Ἀρχιλόχου, Εὐριπίδου, Χοιρίλου are also single books. The connexion (not one of dependence) between Ph. and Aristotle and the character of the books are equally clear: in all of them textual criticism seems to have played a subordinate part (Ph. may have found the text of the tragic poets sufficient as it had been established in the state-copy ordered by Lykurgos<sup>7</sup>), and all interest was concentrated on the problems concerning the matter. In this respect the two authors resemble the rhapsodists, earliest interpreters of Homer, and the sophists. We do not know how wide was the range of the work (the two preserved fragments are concerned with the subject-matter), nor can we infer anything as to Ph. from one of the main works of Eratosthenes: Περὶ ἀρχαίας κωμωδίας contained at least twelve books, and it comprehended the language though textual criticism likewise played only a secondary part. Also, Eratosthenes' work was later by a century. The single book Περὶ Εὐριπίδου was, partly at least, biographical (F 218-220). Possibly the interpretative passages, which dealt with allusions to contemporary persons and similar matters (F 188; 217; 221/2) belong to it; and perhaps the difference from Περὶ τραγωιδιῶν, where Euripides also occurred, consisted in the latter book's contents being mainly mythological. We probably must compare Περὶ Εὐριπίδου with Herakleides' Περὶ τῶν τριῶν τραγωιδιοποιῶν and Aristoxenos' Περὶ τραγωιδιοποιῶν, and in doing so we shall have to state that these authors, of whom Herakleides was active until almost the end of the fourth century, widened the theme, as Dikaiarchos did in regard to the subject-matter. The myths cannot have played a great part in a single book, and it is surprising that Ph. wrote five books about the myths of Sophokles alone<sup>8</sup>). It must remain undiscussed whether the reasons for this were purely material<sup>9</sup>), or whether the fact implies a preference of this poet, which would in a certain degree contradict Aristotle, in whose view Euripides is plainly *the* tragic poet: to him alone he gave a special book (as to the modern epic poet Choirilos). Ph. in his *Atthis* seems sometimes to have followed the versions as shaped by Euripides, but it is conceivable that his sympathy belonged to Sophokles. Discussions about the relative value of the two tragic poets are known to have continued, mostly in the form of criticism on Euripides<sup>10</sup>).

(90) Suda s.v. Χοιρίλη· ἢ Ἐκάβη. Double names, earlier names, re-namings of mythical persons are frequent in epic poetry, but we seldom see the reasons. Concerning Hekabe epic tradition offers nothing of the sort, and the name Χοιρίλη looks rather like a joke from Comedy or from

a satyric play <sup>1</sup>), if not from enigmatic poetry. Wherever Ph. found the name he took it seriously, for he explained it by an Orphic gloss, and after all, the names Χοιρίλος, Χοῖρος, Χοῖρων, Χοιρίων, Χοιρακος etc. are 'old and wide-spread' <sup>2</sup>).

- 5 (91) Serv. Verg. A. 7, 320 *Cisseis*] *regina Hecuba filia secundum Euripidem Cissei, quem Ennius et Pacuvius et Vergilius sequuntur; nam* *Homerus Dymantis dicit.* Of Nikandros (Schol. Eurip. *Hek.* 3 = F 62 Schn) it is also said that he 'agrees with Euripides', but in the verses quoted he only has the ambiguous Ἐκάβη Κισσηίς. The reason and the  
 10 contents of the letter cannot be determined, but it does not appear at all impossible that Ph. merely treated the special question of the parentage of Hekabe <sup>3</sup>). It is interesting that this question led Ph. to the textual criticism not of Homer but of Euripides. Unfortunately we do not know whether he was the first to suggest the reading Κισσίας, but it may be  
 15 founded on ambiguous names in the Iliad as e.g. Βρῆσις and Χρῆσις. In any case, the textual criticism is still quite simple, almost elementary: Ph. mentions Phrygia only, the home of Hekabe's brother <sup>4</sup>), and he suggests that a family or a village Κισσία existed there only by way of conjecture; he does not think of, or at least he does not concern himself  
 20 with, the Thraco-Macedonian town Kissos <sup>5</sup>). Actually the matter is not so simple, and later scholars tried to find the solution of the problem by starting from Homer, partly even then retaining Phrygia: εἰ μὴ ἄρα ὀμομήτριος αὐτῆι δ' Ἄσιος Schol. T Hom. *Il.* Π 718, words one may understand from the fact that ἔτεροι made the river Sangarios the father of He-  
 25 kabe <sup>6</sup>). But already in Pherekydes <sup>6</sup>) (who after the manner of genealogists adds a nymph Εὐθόη as the mother of Hekabe to her Homeric father Dymas and completes the pedigree upwards) Robert, probably correctly, found that the grandfather Eioneus points to Thrace. When Euripides, who was the first to do this (in any case, the interpreters did not find an earlier  
 30 authority), made Hekabe the daughter of Kisseus and incidentally the sister of Theano (who in the Iliad is called Κισσηίς and whose father lives in Thrace <sup>6</sup>)) this statement was neither arbitrary nor a confusion, as the Scholia assume in despair <sup>7</sup>): he must have attached some importance to Thrace, where Kisseus plays a part in the royal family of Mace-  
 35 donia <sup>8</sup>) and elsewhere. We cannot make any progress beyond that. But Hekabe was mentioned frequently in the Cyclic poems, and we probably may assume that Euripides made the alteration on the basis of such passages and the discussions of them by the earliest 'rhapsodic' interpreters of Homer. Unfortunately we know so little about them

that we seldom take them into consideration at all, but the greater number of Homeric 'problems' are pre-literary, as one might say.

(No. 24) The book *Περὶ Ἀλκιμᾶνος* takes us out of the sphere of works which may be explained by Ph.s being Athenian; it is also remarkable because as far as we know it was the first book written about the Laconian poet, for Sosibios (no. 595) is much later than Ph. Though it is tempting to speculate about a particular interest or a topical reason, one had better refrain from doing so <sup>1</sup>), especially as it is not at all certain that it was the only book of that kind which the historian wrote. One may think of assigning to it Ph.s notes about Tyrtaios F 215/6; that would perhaps be more difficult with regard to Stesichoros F 213, and it becomes almost impossible in regard to the pre-Homeric poets, Homer, and Hesiod, grouped together as F 207 ff., for a book on Alkman is not a history of Greek literature. We shall not contend that all information about early literature necessarily derives from books of the *Περὶ*-type, but we shall not pretend either that we are acquainted with the entire work of Ph. What has come down to us are chance quotations, and what they teach us is solely the knowledge that Ph. belonged to the scholars who were interested in the lives, the persons, and the works of the ancient poets, and not of poets alone <sup>2</sup>). We observe the range of authors treated 'scientifically' being increased during the fourth century B.C.: Orpheus, Musaios, and Hesiod were added to Homer who had been studied for a long time; Archilochos and the lyric poets, and eventually the tragic poets and the philosophers follow. What these scholars aimed at, and what form they gave their books are matters much less clear. Leo <sup>3</sup>) has tried to set forth a difference between the type *Περὶ βίων* (Aristoxenos) and that *Περὶ ποιητῶν* or *Περὶ Ἀλκαίου, Σιμωνίδου etc.*, the creation of which is usually ascribed to Chamaileon, probably a later contemporary of Aristoxenos. It is doubtful whether this distinction is correct; it seems more likely that comparatively comprehensive works like *Περὶ ποιητῶν καὶ σοφιστῶν (μουσικῶν)* <sup>4</sup>) came first, to which special works about single groups or persons were added later. Anyhow, Ph.s books on literature belong more to the type *Περὶ ποιητῶν* than to that *Περὶ βίων*.

(Nos. 25-26) The *Συναγωγὴ ἡρωίδων ἤτοι Πυθαγορείων γυναικῶν* can hardly be judged differently from the books about history of literature, whether or not Ph. knew 'Pythagorean' books. The literature of the fourth century about them is uncommonly abundant. *Περὶ Πυθαγορείων* appears among the books of Herakleides of Pontos and those of Aristotle. In Aristoxenos' *Βίοι ἀνδρῶν* the book about Pythagoras is particularly

important; besides him Sokrates and Plato were treated in detail. The Peripatetic Phainias and Idomeneus of Lampsakos (no. 338) wrote *Περὶ Σωκρατικῶν*. As to Ph. the restriction to the women is remarkable and possibly meant to fill a gap. Here too it is dangerous to speculate, 5 though *Ἡρώιδες* in the title (apparently deriving from Ph. himself) seems to show some relation to the school <sup>1</sup>), or at least Ph.'s admiration of its founder. Consequently we shall prefer to understand the *Σύμβολα* as meaning *Πυθαγορικὰ σύμβολα*, which were frequently discussed in special books from the *Συμβόλων Πυθαγορείων Ἐξήγησις* of the younger 10 Anaximander of Miletos (no. 9) onward <sup>2</sup>), not as a special book on one kind of divination, the *ἐκ φήμης μαντεῖαι*, which Ph. is said to have called *σύμβολα* <sup>3</sup>). In no case must the book be athetized <sup>4</sup>).

(No. 27) It would lead us much too far here to deal exhaustively with the literature *Περὶ εὐρημάτων*, the remains of which will be collected 15 in a section of vol. IV. But a mere glance at the series of authors (most of them distinguished) whom we know to have written books with this title in the fourth (and perhaps already at the end of the fifth) century B.C.—Simonides (no. 8), Skamon (son of Hellanikos: no. 476), Ephoros (70 F 2-5), Herakleides of Pontos, Aristotle, Theophrastos, Straton— is sufficient to disprove the fashionable scepticism which doubts a separate 20 book by Ph. and suggests that the title covers an 'appendix' to, or an extract from, the *Atthis*. The fact that inventions were frequently mentioned in the *Atthis* (particularly in its first two books) and in other books of Ph. is no reason for such an assumption; the contrary is the case.

25

## FRAGMENTS WITHOUT THE TITLE OF A BOOK

Concerning the following fragments it must be stressed that none of them should be assigned to the *Atthis* without special reasons, for the commentators and lexicographers had the entire works of Ph. at their disposal. Nevertheless *ceteris paribus* there is a slight presumption in 30 favour of the *Atthis* as being the most widely read work. The point is important because the literary activity of Ph. extends over four decades approximately, and some vestiges of change in his opinions can be traced.

(92) Eusebius in his excerpt from Africanus <sup>1</sup>) cites Ph. twice: (1) together with Hellanikos and a number of later authors <sup>2</sup>) for the interval 35 of 1020 years between the 'autochthon' Ogygos, the alleged earliest name in Attic history, and *Ol. 1*, which carries the reign of Ogygos back to 1796/5 B.C. <sup>3</sup>); (2) for the fact that Ph. disputed the existence of kings 'after Ogygos', one of whom (the last?) was Aktaios. In order to be



able to make use of these citations we shall have to give some general data. Between the books about various oriental peoples, published during the later years of Ph.'s life, and the Greek Chronicles this difference exists: Berossos and Manetho, like the Jews later on (and even the Romans), could work with lists of kings which were uniform (or central) and redacted authoritatively by certain priesthoods, whereas for the chronographer of the Greek people a uniform, or authoritative, thread, on which to string the single facts, was lacking. The difficulty put before him may be compared to that which the World Chronicles had to overcome, the various peoples being for these records what the various Greek towns were for the Greek chronographers. Not one of these towns (and that is the second difference from the East) had a thread reaching back further than the seventh century and at the same time chronologically applicable: for even where a series of names attested to some extent existed (and this is hardly the case even in regard to Sparta), numbers for the length of reigns and epochal dates were lacking. Consequently the first business of the local historian was to create a chronological scaffolding for his town in order to fix the events mostly not assigned to a date particularly in the early periods, and to arrange them in a (more or less arbitrary) chronological sequence. This was done for Athens, where we perceive these things most clearly, by Hellanikos not until (or already at) the end of the fifth century. The list of kings which he constructed opens nine hundred years in round numbers (27 generations) before the beginning of the list of archons (683/2 B.C.), thus at once carrying back the beginning of Attic history to the middle of the second millennium <sup>4</sup>). Seen from the view-point of Greek history that is remote antiquity, though it appeared late when compared with the Egyptian dates made known by the Ionian historians. In this first period of scientific chronology the universal chronicler of the Greek people had no other course but to choose among the local lists (themselves only recently constructed) and to reconcile with them as well as he could the dates of the other lists, *i.e.* to create synchronisms. Hellanikos chose the series of priestesses of Hera at Argos (not the list of the Argive kings which we find in Kastor <sup>5</sup>), which may derive from local Ἀργολικὰ, Charon of Lampsakos chose the *πρυτάνεις* Λακεδαιμονίων whatever that means <sup>6</sup>). Other authors may have chosen other lists, but the Ὀλυμπιάδων ἀναγραφή of Hippias is perhaps more likely to have been a local book than a universal chronicle. The fact that the first universal history, that of Ephoros, had no real chronological system but counted by generations <sup>7</sup>) proves sufficiently that none of the earlier

attempts had been found satisfactory. This explains the thorough success of Timaios who was the first to furnish parallel lists, in which Spartan kings, ephors, archons, priestesses of Hera, and Olympiads were arranged alongside in order to create a basis for chronological determinations<sup>8</sup>). The second period of Greek chronography begins with Eratosthenes, who resolutely made the first Olympiad the cardinal point of the universal Greek Chronicles, and whose *Χρονογραφία* (in the revision of Apollodoros) became the authoritative book for all later authors<sup>9</sup>). Although Eratosthenes and Apollodoros (probably following Timaios) assigned a special position to the Spartan list of kings at least for the time between the Trojan War and the first Olympiad and dated in that period by Spartan kings<sup>10</sup>), the natural consequence was that the first Olympiad more and more decisively became the beginning of Greek history properly attested. The local lists of kings (being originally upward extensions of the documentary lists of eponyms and being almost admittedly artificial constructions) were brought into accordance with this cardinal point, or at least had to take it into consideration. Thus we understand, for instance, why Ph., although he naturally gave an Athenian date *e.g.* for Homer (F 211), not a Spartan as Eratosthenes later did<sup>11</sup>), wrote *Ὀλυμπιάδες* in two books<sup>12</sup>). But wherever a more or less general date occurs, we have to ask whether it derives from a universal chronicle or from a local one. The actual difficulty is this: in the mother country at least the universal chronicle, founded on research from the first, is earlier than the local chronicles, and the latter are, from the beginning, under the influence of the former, which obtained its *cachet* from being scientific and universal<sup>13</sup>). But we are so ignorant about the local chronicles that we cannot tell how this influence asserted itself: are the local chronicles dependent for their own system on local dates<sup>14</sup>) or on universal systems, and is it possible to explain discrepancies in the fundamental dates of the local lists<sup>15</sup>) by this dependence? On the other hand, it is of less importance whether historians actually decided to make *Ol. 1* the beginning of attested Greek history<sup>16</sup>), or whether they assigned a sort of intermediate position to the immediately preceding period between the Trojan War or the return of the Heraclids<sup>17</sup>). It is more important that not very long after Apollodoros, the third period of Greek chronography, which may be said to begin with Kastor's *Χρονικῶν Ἐπιτομή*, (no. 250; in any case the most influential book for later writers), again gave up that reserved attitude and re-included the mythical period, supplying lists of kings, if not *ab origine mundi*, at least *ab origine populi*

*Graeci*; for that step signifies in fact a renewed disintegration of universal chronicles into lists of kings of the various Greek states, between which a series of synchronisms furnished the connecting lines <sup>18</sup>). Jewish-Christian Chronography, which immediately followed this third period, could not simply treat as non-existent these lists beginning before the Olympiads and before the Trojan War. But as the main purpose of that chronography was to prove the greater age of Oriental, and particularly of Biblical, tradition, and to use for this purpose Greek evidence as far as possible, it accentuates strongly and repeatedly the judgement passed on traditionally by Hellenistic research which admitted the unreliability of the evidence for dates and facts in the 'mythical' period, to which all these lists of kings belong. Naturally its representatives prefer the greatest extension of that period down to the beginning of the Olympiads <sup>19</sup>); they did not, however, definitely exclude as the lower boundary the Trojan War which occurred some 400 years earlier <sup>20</sup>). They were not greatly interested in all these dates for the period *ἐν οἷς τὰ ἐν Ἑλλησι θαυμάσια μυθολογεῖται*, and they did not care to discuss the discrepancies between the Greek local lists and the resulting controversy about the relative ages and priorities. They simply reported, and the learned references to the discrepancies in the tradition—which were probably still abundant in Kastor who decided for Sikyon as the oldest Greek town <sup>21</sup>)—have disappeared with the exception of a few accidental remains; they are replaced by collective citations (older in themselves) such as *οἱ τὰς Ἀτθίδας, οἱ τὰ Σύρια*, which now could be used to efface these discrepancies. It is not an accident that the *Atthides* now obtain a place by the side of Oriental history, for with the upward move of the beginning of Greek history, which Kastor had brought about, the Spartan list lost the importance it had had for Timaios, Eratosthenes, and Apollodoros as the chronological backbone: Attic tradition again steps into the foreground.

We can deal now with the two citations from Ph., taking first the interval of 1020 years between Ogygos and Ol. I. After the survey of the development of Greek chronography nobody will venture to derive it straight from Ph. or Hellanikos, if the latter name came down to (Kastor and) Africanus through Ph. <sup>22</sup>). The citation of Diodoros raises particular doubts <sup>23</sup>), and that of Polyhistor, which unfortunately cannot be checked, seems to indicate that the collective citation does not give purely Greek, but unites two different currents of, tradition <sup>24</sup>). But even if we admit the possibility (as we must do at least provisionally <sup>25</sup>)) that an interval calculated by the first Atthidographer on the basis of

his universal system was passed on as a traditional citation (*i.e.* independent of, and in no connexion with, Africanus' own system) we do not gain anything for the reconstruction of Ph.'s Attic list. Neither Boeckh's assumption<sup>26</sup>) 'that the entire Eusebian Canon of kings and archons preceding Kreon mainly emanated from Ph.' nor Brandis'<sup>27</sup>) attempt to prove that the Attic list of Ph. has been preserved in the so-called *Excerpta Barbari* need be refuted at length. The former opinion is due to a misinterpretation of F 211, the latter is purely arbitrary, and both authors had no sufficient insight into the development of ancient chronography. But even the more recent attempts underestimate the absence of absolute dates for the systems preceding Kastor, and they overestimate the possibilities of overcoming it by conjecture<sup>28</sup>). The first difficulty of making use of an interval which has come down to us as so isolated a statement consists in the fact that the list of pre-Trojan kings given by 15 Ph. probably had eleven names, whereas Hellanikos gave nine<sup>29</sup>). The second difficulty is that this longer list is extant in two versions, *viz.* that of the *Atthis* used in the *Marmor Parium* of 264/3 B.C., the author(s) of which we do not know (but Ph. certainly was not among them<sup>30</sup>), and that of Kastor (250 F 4), who lived quite two centuries 20 later. The two versions differ in this that Kastor's list opens twenty-five years later than the other: the first year of Kekrops in the *Marmor* is 1581/0 (1582/1), in Kastor 1556/5 B.C. As the same difference exists between the two dates for the fall of Troy (1209/7: 1184/3), the explanation certainly is that someone adapted an earlier Attic list to the 25 first cardinal date of Eratosthenes' system, the *Τροίας ἄλωσις*. We cannot tell who was the first to do this—Kastor, in whose time the epoch of Eratosthenes accepted by Apollodoros had driven all others into the background, or Eratosthenes already, or even Timaios. In the later part of the list the difference mounted up to thirty years and must 30 then have been levelled out somehow before the year of Kreon 683/2 B.C., which was the fixed starting-point of every Attic chronology<sup>31</sup>). Perhaps this was done by degrading the last four kings to *ἄρχοντες δεκαετείς*<sup>32</sup>). It is further possible that these archons for ten years are merely an invention of chronography, but we do not see clearly: Kastor divides the whole 35 series of sovereigns preceding Kreon into the three groups of *βασιλείς* (from Kekrops to Kodros), *ἄρχοντες διὰ βίου* (from Medon to Aischylos, Alkmaion), *ἄρχοντες δεκαετείς* (seven names from Charops to Eryxias), while the *Marmor* dates throughout with the formula *βασιλεύοντος* 'Αθήνησι τοῦ δεῖνα, but gives no entry at all for the last century before

Kreon, which includes the period of the δεκαετείς <sup>32a</sup>). Consequently in that period discrepancies between the two versions as to the number and the names of the eponyms may have existed; in the main part of the list of round about eight hundred years they are impossible as far as we can see.

5 The third and main difficulty is that we are not in a position to decide whether Ph. still dated in the same way as the *Atthis* used in the Marmor, or already (perhaps on the basis of a system worked out in the 'Ολυμπιάδες) agreed with the modern system of Timaios(-Eratosthenes) <sup>32b</sup>; for we are completely unable to establish the *absolute* date of any single

10 fact reported by Ph. for the time before Solon (Kreon). The only entry which counts in this respect, F 211 (preserved by Christian authors only and uncertain whether from the *Atthis*), determines the *floruit* of Homer by the three datings μετὰ τὴν Ἴωνικὴν ἀποικίαν, ἐπὶ ἀρχοντος Ἀθήνησιον Ἀρχίππου, τῶν Ἰλιακῶν ὕστερον ἔτεσιν ῥπ; but only the second, an Attic

15 date as would be expected from Ph., can unhesitatingly be regarded as authentic, while the two others are evident additions by the intermediate source from which Tatianus took his survey of the various statements regarding Homer. This intermediate source (not a very early one) converted widely different (and partly local) dates so as to agree with the

20 dominant chronology of Eratosthenes(-Apollodoros); it then arranged them according to their distance from the great fixed points of this system: the Trojan War 1184/3 B.C., the return of the Heraclids 1104/3 B.C., the Ionic migration 1044/3 B.C. The '180 years later than the *Iliaka*' in the system of Eratosthenes brings us close to the middle year (= 1003/2)

25 of the reign of Archippos (1012/1-994/3), 'forty years after the Ionic migration' as Eusebios adds <sup>34</sup>). Neither of the two intervals tells us anything about the list of Ph.

The question whether the interval of 1020 years between Ogygos and Ol. 1 derives from Ph. can therefore not be answered by general consider-

30 ations. The second quotation, concerning a kingless period of 189 years between Ogygos and Kekrops, however, gives the decision in the negative. Its problematical character has not yet been sufficiently recognized. Not only does it look at first sight more reliable than the collective quotation of six authors, it obviously is (like the citation from Akusilaos)

35 one of the learned notes found by Africanus in one of his sources. The author of this note referred to Ph. in order to give the reason why a continuous list of Attic kings could not begin until Kekrops. In the wording of Africanus this can only mean (and has always been understood to mean) that Ph. acknowledged the 'autochthon' Ogygos as

Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.) 25

having preceded Kekrops, but that he rejected as an 'invention' the series of kings between them among whom Aktaios<sup>35</sup>) is the only one mentioned by name. This seems to imply that Ph. rejected an earlier list of pre-Kekropian kings which may have been that of Hellanikos<sup>36</sup>).

5 But against this jumping back across half a millennium from Africanus to Ph., the quotation from Akusilaos, which we possess in the earlier and fuller context of Clement<sup>37</sup>), ought to warn us: Akusilaos declared that Phoroneus was 'the first man', doubtless following the *Phoronis*; Clement's source added that Plato followed Akusilaos when making in

10 his *Timaios* Solon discuss τὰ τῆϊδε<sup>38</sup>) ἀρχαιότατα: περὶ Φορωνέως τε τοῦ πρώτου λεχθέντος καὶ Νιόβης, καὶ μετὰ τὸν κατακλισμὸν αὐτῶν περὶ Δευκαλιωνος καὶ Πύρρας. That is a learned inference from the literature Περὶ κλοπῆς, which may be correct for the second link too<sup>39</sup>), for it would be in keeping with the tendency of the genealogist, who actually is the

15 first local historian of Argos, to make Argive history begin long before the common ancestor of all Hellenes<sup>40</sup>). But the chronological authority of Clement has embedded this learned and reliable note in an Argive list which begins with Inachos, the (divine) father of Phoroneus, and which under Phoroneus records 'the Ogygian flood'<sup>41</sup>). The quotation from

20 Plato is manipulated correspondingly: it breaks off before the names Deukalion-Pyrrha and by inserting a τὰ before the words μετὰ τὸν κατακλισμὸν creates the impression that Plato and Akusilaos had already mentioned a flood in the reign of Phoroneus. The very same thing has happened in the Attic list which Eusebios excerpted from Kastor:

25 Kastor (250 F 4) quite distinctly makes it begin with Kekrops, but Eusebios precedes this by an introduction in which the same adapted quotation from Plato implies Ogygos as the first Athenian, 'the great and old flood', and the synchronism Ogygos-Phoroneus. Obviously this basis does not bear the ordinary assumption that Ph. and Hellanikos mentioned

30 Ogygos as the first king of Athens, and accordingly the further inferences (flood under Ogygos, and a period without kings) drop out as well. In fact, the earlier tradition of the Atthis, as we know it from the Marmor Parium, Pausanias and even Kastor, does not know anything about these persons and matters<sup>42</sup>). This is not a mere conclusion *e silentio*, for in

35 his Attic list Kastor records under Kekrops *unter welchem auch zu Deukalions tagen die sintflut gekommen sei (sagen sie) nach Thessalien* and five generations earlier in the Argive list under Phoroneus *unter diesem hat Ogygos Eleusina erbaut*<sup>43</sup>). We need not face here the question about the origin and the nature of Ogygos generally and the Eleusinian

Ogygos in particular, of whom we hear in other contexts also <sup>44</sup>). The essential fact is that Atthidography (which frequently considered the tradition of the demes and no doubt sometimes stated that it did not agree with the fundamental central tradition of the town of Athens <sup>46</sup>) did not know Ogygos as a king of Athens or Attica. At the utmost he was known as a local king like Porphyrion, Kolainos, Munichos. The last-named occurred in the second book of Hellanikos' *Atthis* <sup>46</sup>), not in the first which would have contained the list of the kings preceding Kekrops, if Hellanikos furnished it (that he did so we can no longer believe). One version groups the Eleusinian Ogygos together with Okeanos (obviously a playful etymology), but even this version does not know about an Ogygian flood <sup>47</sup>). Among profane authors Varro is the first to know a flood of Ogygos which forms the end of the first epoch of the world <sup>48</sup>). His date and his designation as *cataclysmus prior* equally prove that he had in mind not the Greek story of Deukalion and Pyrrha, but the catastrophe of oriental tradition. The author, on whom he and other Roman writers drew, has been placed by Africanus at the end of the collective quotation: it is Alexander Polyhistor <sup>49</sup>). The question may remain open whether it was he who created the syncretistic combination of Greek and Oriental tradition which counts the floods and puts the first under the name of Ogygos <sup>50</sup>), or whether the Jewish chronographers preceded him, the knowledge of whom in Christian chronography may entirely derive from Alexander Polyhistor <sup>51</sup>). The essential result for our investigation is that the quotation from Ph. is quite as traditional as that from Akusilaos. Both have passed through many hands, and nobody will expect that precisely the quotation from Ph. retained its original form in the syncretistic surroundings. King Ogygos proves to be an addition as well as the first flood; and we must definitely abandon the belief that Ph. (whose intervals are anyhow more likely to depend on the year of Kreon 683/2 B.C.) is the authority for the interval of 1020 years between Ogygos and Ol. 1 <sup>52</sup>).

What we learn from the two quotations is that Ph.'s list of Attic kings (and incidentally his Attic history) opened with Kekrops, and that he gave the reasons for this point of opening in a polemical passage which dealt with the figure of Aktaios. This polemical passage in Ph. must be assumed, for the old tradition, the origin of which lies long before the first Athenian *Atthis* and even before Hellanikos, actually demands it. This tradition names Kekrops as the first Attic king: Herodt. 8, 44, 2 <sup>53</sup>); Thukyd. 2, 15, 1 <sup>54</sup>). We cannot be sure whether Hellanikos followed the

same tradition, but after Ogygos has dropped out for him too, it appears very probable that he did. Seen from the point of view of history of tradition this means that the λόγοι ἄνδρες, to whom Herodotos owes his knowledge of Attic pre-history, in the alternative between the two first kings Kekrops and Erichthonios-Erechtheus had decided for the priority of the former <sup>56</sup>). We do not know their reasons, but they are more likely to be found in religious belief and in the ἱεροὶ λόγοι about the two cults of the Akropolis <sup>56</sup>) than in the linguistic speculations which made Kekrops appear a barbarian and Erechtheus a Greek, although <sup>10</sup> such speculations would not be impossible after the publication of Hekataios' books which were widely read in Athens. It is not unlikely that it was already the λόγοι ἄνδρες who made out of the snake or the composite figure the human king that he is in historical literature throughout <sup>57</sup>). The 'autochthon Aktaios' immediately precedes Kekrops <sup>15</sup> in one of the *Atthides* used by the *Marmor Parium*, in that used by Pausanias (Philochoros?), and others <sup>58</sup>). It is perhaps not an accident that in the Marble not only this epithet is lacking for Kekrops but πρῶτος as well, for Pausan. 1, 2, 6 (5, 3) <sup>59</sup>) expressly says Ἀκταίων λέγουσιν ἐν τῇ νῦν Ἀττικῇ βασιλεῦσαι πρῶτον ἀποθανόντος δὲ Ἀκταίου Κέκροψ <sup>20</sup> ἐκδέχεται τὴν ἀρχὴν θυγατρὶ συνοικῶν Ἀκταίου, καὶ οἱ γίνονται θυγατέρες μὲν Ἔρση καὶ Ἀγλαυρος καὶ Πιάνδροσος, υἱὸς δὲ Ἐρυσίχθων. This Aktaios is quite a shadowy figure: he is not like Kekrops and Erechtheus the object of a cult in the city, nor does he appear among the heroes either of the phylai or of the demes <sup>60</sup>). As the father of Telamon we find him only <sup>25</sup> in Pherekydes (3 F 60), and as he expressly states that Telamon was 'a friend, not a brother of Peleus' it is an assumption of long standing that Aktaios was invented (certainly by Pherekydes himself) as the representative of Athens <sup>61</sup>). The invention belongs to the dispute about Salamis: when according to the same Pherekydes (3 F 2) 'Philaias, son of Aias, <sup>30</sup> settled in Athens', he returned to the old home of the clan; and as the mother of Telamon was the daughter of Kynchreus, he brought with him the claim to Salamis. In regard to the autochthon Aktaios as the first king of Athens and eponymous hero of the country we have the alternative that he was either freely invented <sup>62</sup>) or developed not from <sup>35</sup> a figure of cult or of genuine mythus, but from the literary invention of Pherekydes, whom, in a certain sense, we might call the first local historian of Athens as Akusilaos was of Argos. The invention had a certain success, perhaps with those authors who did not find Kekrops early enough: the Marble shows that one Atthidographer at least supported



(and probably introduced) Aktaios as a pre-Kekropian king, and it cannot very well be doubted that the criticism of Ph. was directed against a list containing this king. If we can trust the quotation of Africanus in this respect (and I do not find any reason for distrusting it), and if 5 Ph. altogether contested the existence of Aktaios (οὐδὲ γενέσθαι φησὶ Φιλόχορος), he must have given a different explanation of the name of Attika <sup>63</sup>). This seems all the more likely as he contradicts the Marble also concerning the name of the city <sup>64</sup>).

(93-98) Even if one or another of these fragments (F 98 would be 10 the most likely) has passed through the intermediary stage of the literature *Περὶ εὐρημάτων*, they show that Ph. treated the first Attic king whom he acknowledged <sup>1</sup>) with some fulness in the *Atthis*. He conceived this first king as being entirely human (F 93 is decisive), not even as being the first man: the simple-minded genealogy of an Akusilaos <sup>2</sup>) 15 was a thing of the past. Kekrops is the first political organizer of his people <sup>3</sup>), and beyond that the bringer of civilization: he founded cities (F 94), and we may assume that Ph., who himself had written *Περὶ εὐρημάτων* <sup>4</sup>), understood them to be the first cities of all <sup>5</sup>); he holds the first census (F 95); he is the first legislator (F 96) <sup>6</sup>); he establishes the earliest 20 cults (F 97); he invents the first weapons and armour (F 98). So much is certain, other things remain dubious <sup>7</sup>). The wording of Steph. Byz. s.v. 'Αθῆναι that 'the Athenians are said to have been the first to invent τὰ ἄστυ καὶ τὰς πόλεις' and Ph. himself explaining in his first book the word ἄστυ (F 2) make it appear probable that the Atthidographer 25 systematically described here the παλαιὸς βίος of the νομάδες καὶ σποράδην ζῶντες, sometimes referred to in the fragments <sup>8</sup>), and the introduction of civilization. The conception of a heroic (or mythic) bringer of culture ('*kulturheros*') is an old one, but the Atthidographer differs from Aischylos as well as from Protagoras' *Περὶ τῆς ἐν ἀρχῇ καταστάσεως*, Thukydides 30 and Demokritos, who converted this idea into a history of civilisation, both by confining himself to Athens and by assigning the several innovations, mostly of cult (introduction of gods, festivals *etc.*), to certain kings. We do not see very clearly about the particulars of Ph.s 'history of civilization', but the manner of making the first king(s) lay the foundations 35 proper of it (in spite of obvious differences natural in books of so widely different purposes) does call to mind the first 'historic' section in the Egyptian history of civilization by Hekataios of Abdera which contained the achievements of the god-kings, the ἐπίγειοι θεοί. Ph. may very well have read that book, which was published in his time <sup>9</sup>) and became

famous at once, and a connexion between the two works would be all the more likely as Hekataios in a lengthy digression dealt with the relations between Athens and Egypt <sup>10</sup>). Ph. could not simply ignore that question which was discussed with particular zeal during the fourth century; he could not leave uncontradicted the detailed proof by which Hekataios, citing the Athenians themselves, had again decided in favour of the priority of Egypt, making some of the Athenian kings who had been bringers of civilization immigrants from Egypt. We can hardly believe the scholar Ph. capable of simply reversing the relation as was done by the over-patriotic and not over-scrupulous Phanodemos (325 F 25); it is much more plausible to suggest that both the new explanation of Κέκροψ διφυής <sup>11</sup>) and the new etymology of ἄστν, meant to prove the Greek origin of this Athenian 'invention' <sup>12</sup>), were directed against Hekataios.

- (93) Schol. Aristoph. *Plut.* 773 (Suda s.v. Κέκροψ) · Κέκροψ Αἰγύπτιος ἄν τὸ γένος ὤκισσε (Sud FVM-ἦσε 1 Schol) τὰς Ἀθήνας, ὅθεν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι Κεκροπίδαι. τινὲς δὲ φασι τοῦτον καὶ διφυῆ γεγενῆσθαι, οἱ μὲν ὅτι τὰ μὲν ἄνω ἀνδρὸς εἶχε, τὰ δὲ κάτω θηρίου (κάτω γυναικὸς, οἱ δὲ θηρίου Sud) <sup>1</sup>) · ἕτεροι δὲ ὅτι νόμους πολλοὺς ἐφεῦρε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, καὶ ἀπὸ ἀγριότητος <αὐτοῦς> εἰς ἡμερότητα ἤγαγεν <sup>2</sup>). ἄλλοι δὲ ὅτι τῶν ἀνδρῶν ὡς ἔτυχε μισογόμενων ταῖς γυναιξί, καὶ ἐκ τούτου μὴ γινωσκομένου ἢ τοῦ παιδὸς παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἢ τοῦ πατρὸς παρὰ τοῦ παιδός, αὐτὸς νόμους θέμενος ὥστε φανερώς συγγίνεσθαι αὐταῖς καὶ μιᾷ στοιχεῖν (μὴ ἀστοχεῖν V) καὶ σχεδὸν εὐρῶν τὰς δύο φύσεις τοῦ τε πατρὸς καὶ τῆς μητρός, τούτου χάριν διφυῆς ἐκλήθη <sup>3</sup>). Johann. Antioch. *F H Gr IV* 547, 13 § 5 (Malalas p. 70 ff.; Suda s.v. Προμηθεύς) ἐβασίλευσε δὲ πρῶτος Κέκροψ, ὅστις διφυῆς ἐκλήθη διὰ τὸ τοῦ σώματος μέγεθος · δς ἐνομοθέτησε γυναικας ἐκδίδοσθαι ἀνδρὶ ἐνί, πρότερον θηριωδῶς μιγνυμένας, τοῦτο δ' ἐποίησεν ὡς ἐξ Αἰγύπτου καταγόμενος, τὴν νομοθεσίαν Ἐφαίστου οὐκ ἀγνοῶν · ἔλεγε δὲ ὅτι καὶ διὰ τὴν τοιαύτην τῆς ἀσελγείας κακοήθειαν ἢ Ἀττικὴ κατεκλύσθη <sup>4</sup>). Plutarch. *De sera* 6 p. 551 EF οἶμαι μὲν οὖν καὶ τὸν Κέκροπα διφυᾶ προσαγορεύσαι τοὺς παλαιούς, οὐχ ὡς ἐνιοὶ λέγουσιν ἐκ χρηστοῦ βασιλέως ἄγριον καὶ δρακοντώδη γενόμενον τύραννον, ἀλλὰ τούναντίον ἐν ἀρχῇ σκολιὸν ὄντα καὶ φοβερόν, εἰθ' ὕστερον ἀρξάντα πράως καὶ φιλανθρώπως. Schol. Aristeid. p. 17, 24; 18, 7 Ddf (Tzet. *Lykophr.* III) Σάϊς . . . οἰκιστῆρα εἶχεν Ἐρεχθεά (!) · διὸ καὶ διφυᾶ προσαγορεύεσθαι φησιν (Charax 103 F 39) ὄντα δίγλωσσον. ἕτεροι δὲ φασιν ὅτι πρῶτος ἐδόξασεν ἐκ τε γυναικὸς καὶ ἀνδρὸς τοὺς γεννωμένους παράγεσθαι. Diod. I, 28, 6 (= Hekataios of Abdera) <sup>5</sup>) τὸν γὰρ Πέτην (!) τὸν πατέρα Μενεσθέως τοῦ στρατεύσαντος εἰς Τροίαν φανερώς Αἰγύπτιον ὑπάρξαντα τυχεῖν ὕστερον Ἀθήνησι πολιτείας τε καὶ βασιλείας. (7) \* \*διφυοῦς δ' αὐτοῦ γεγονότος τοὺς μὲν Ἀθηναίους μὴ δύνασθαι κατὰ τὴν

ἴδιαν ὑπόστασιν ἀποδοῦναι περὶ τῆς φύσεως ταύτης τὰς ἀληθεῖς αἰτίας, ἐν μέσῳ κειμένου πᾶσιν ὅτι δυοῖν πολιτειῶν μετασχῶν Ἑλληνικῆς καὶ βαρβάρου, διφυῆς ἐνομιόθη τὸ μὲν ἔχων μέρος θηρίου, τὸ δὲ ἀνθρώπου.

The Scholion on Aristophanes shows that Eusebios' quotation of Ph. 5 must be treated like the second quotation in F 92: it applies only to the interpretation of the epithet διφυῆς<sup>9</sup>) which makes Kekrops a man of extraordinary bodily size. The inference, disputable in point of logic too, that Ph. 'therefore conceived him as a Giant'<sup>7</sup>) overlooks the fact that his interpretation is merely one of many attempts at rationalization.

10 We have no reason to explain it differently from those of Klearchos, Hekataios, and others, and there is no sense in substituting another miraculous creature for the being composed of man and snake, which is the Kekrops of faith and of art in the fifth century. As an answer to the latest hypothesis, which used the epithet in order to prove the Egyptian

15 origin of the first king, Ph.s new explanation was very useful indeed. It is as wrong as any other rationalistic explanation, but more attractive, for extraordinary size of the body was ascribed to many heroes, who are not therefore regarded as 'Giants'. If Kekrops was a human being in Ph.s

20 view he probably assumed that the Kekropion (evidently a very old place of worship on the Akropolis<sup>8</sup>)) was his tomb. The evidence for 'the tomb' is late<sup>9</sup>), and I doubt whether in cult the Kekropion was ever regarded as such. Apart from general considerations about 'tombs of heroes'<sup>10</sup>), the conclusion of Elderkin<sup>11</sup>) (incredible in other respects too)—'the relation of Cecrops to Erechtheus suggests that Cecrops suffered

25 the same fate as Erechtheus and was buried where he fell' (*viz.* under the trident of Poseidon)—has no support, at least not in the tradition which knows nothing about a catastrophic end of Kekrops, but throughout assumes a natural death: Isokr. *Panath.* 126 Ἐριχθόνιος . . . παρὰ Κέκροπος ἄπαιδος ὄντος ἀρρένων παίδων τὸν οἶκον καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν παρέλαβεν; Pausan.

30 I, 2, 6 (Ἐρυσίχθονι) τοῦ πατρὸς ζῶντος τελευτήσαι συνέβη, καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν τὴν Κέκροπος Κραναδὸς ἐξεδέξατο Ἀθηναίων δυνάμει προύχων; *Bibl.* 3, 186 Κέκροπος δὲ ἀποθανόντος Κραναδὸς <ἐβασίλευσεν> αὐτόχθων ὢν. Isokrates, it is true, colours matters for his purpose, but from the silence of the *Bibliotheca* we may safely draw an inference (if only *e contrario*) as to the Attic

35 tradition about the end of Kekrops: it not only reports the annihilation of Erechtheus' house by Poseidon<sup>12</sup>), it also knows about the wrath of the god because of his defeat in the contest with Athena in Kekrops' time; but that wrath is aimed at the land, not at Kekrops<sup>13</sup>). The description of the reign of Kekrops, (οὔτος - ἐκλήθη)<sup>14</sup>), into which the

variants about the epithet *διφυής* have been inserted, does not belong to Ph. It evidently opened with a record of the contest of the gods for the possession of the city, and it ended with Athena's giving it the name of Athens, while in Ph.s report (F 94) the town of Kekrops is called *Κεκροπία*, elsewhere (in the Parian Marble and the *Bibliotheca*) the designation of the whole of Attica. It remains dubious at first sight whether the second sentence beginning with *οὔτος* belongs to the same report, the anonymous quotation of *τινές* thus applying to the whole description; but the two facts stated in it evidently belong together: whoever 'gives his name to the god' introduces his cult and this cult consists in the sacrifice of the ox.<sup>16</sup>) These statements cannot be taken from Ph.: F 98 precludes the sacrifice of the (domesticated) ox, and F 97 makes the cult of Zeus in Kekrops' time at least improbable. Also according to Androtion the sacrifice of an ox for Zeus Polieus is introduced in the reign of Erechtheus<sup>16</sup>). Though it is by no means certain that Ph. followed Androtion so closely in the history of the cults (and in the first book generally) as he did in the account of historic events, the *ὕστερον δὲ ἤδη βέες ἐθύοντο* in F 98 seems to indicate that both authors agreed on this point; and if this is true, we may understand *ὕστερον* with some confidence as referring to Erechtheus, who in the tradition competes with Kekrops also in regard to the cult of Zeus<sup>17</sup>). There is hardly a doubt that the Zeus of F 93 was Zeus Polieus in the ultimate Attidographic authority of Africanus-Eusebios too; but in the time of Kekrops it is tempting to refer the introduction of his cult to the context of the dispute of the gods, comparing Hesych. s.v. *Διὸς θᾶκοι καὶ πεσσοί· τινές γράφουσι ψῆφοι· φασὶ δὲ ἐν τῇ τῶν Ἀθηναίων διαψήφισει ὅτε ἡμφισβήτει Ἀθηναῖα καὶ Ποσειδῶν, τὴν Ἀθηναῖν Διὸς δεηθῆναι ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς τὴν ψῆφον ἐνεγκεῖν, καὶ ὑποσχέσθαι ἀντὶ τούτου τὸ τοῦ Πολιείως ἱερεῖον πρῶτον θύεσθαι ἐπὶ βωμοῦ*. So we come back to our assertion that we cannot assign more to Ph. than what is covered by the quotation; who the *τινές* were, we cannot tell.

(94) Et. Gen. p. 118 Mi; Et.M. p. 352, 53 (Suda s.v. Ἐπακτρία χώρα<sup>1</sup>)) Ἐπακτρία χώρα· Ἀθηναίους πάλαι κωμηδονοικοῦντας πρῶτος Κέκροψ συναγαγὼν κατώικισεν εἰς πόλεις (φυλάς Sud) δυοκαίδεκα, καὶ τὴν τῶν ἑπολιτῶν οἰκονομῆσαν ἄφ' ἑαυτοῦ Κεκροπίαν προσηγόρευσεν. δύο δὲ Τετραπόλεις ἐκάλεσεν ἐκ (ἐκ τῶν Sud) τεσσάρων πόλεων ἑκατέραν μοῖραν καταστήσας, τρεῖς δὲ τὰς λοιπὰς Ἐπακτίας (Et V -τρίδας Et Sud) ὠνόμασε, καὶ ἡ προσεχῆς χώρα ταύταις ταῖς τρισὶν ὀμωνύμως αὐταῖς Ἐπακρία (-κτριάς Sud) ἐκαλεῖτο. Ῥητορικὴ (om. Sud.). Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἐπακρία (-ἀκρία ο)· μία τῶν ἐπὶ Κέκροπος συνοικισθει-

σῶν ἰβ̄ πόλεων διὰ τὸ λήζεσθαι ὑπὸ Καρῶν <τὴν χώραν> <sup>3)</sup> · τὸ ἔθνηκόν 'Ἐπακρῆς-  
 Id. s.v. 'Αθῆναι· . . . . ἢ ἐν τῇ 'Αττικῇ, περι ἧς φησι Χάραξ (103 F 43)  
 ὅτι Θησεὺς τὰς ἰβ̄ πόλεις <sup>4)</sup> τὰς ἐν τῇ 'Αττικῇ συνοικίσας εἰς 'Αθήνας Συ-  
 νόικια ἐορτὴν κατεστήσατο. As the parallel tradition is so unsatisfactory  
 5 it is not easy to supply the twelfth town which has dropped out of the  
 text of Strabo <sup>5)</sup>. Φάληρος (*sic*), which in some late manuscripts is placed  
 at the end of the list and appears as τὰ Φάληρα among the seven names  
 of περιφανεῖς δῆμοι excerpted by Psellos, is a conjecture <sup>6)</sup>; as such it is  
 better than Αθῆναι suggested by Gemistos Plethon, but worse  
 10 than modern suggestions <sup>7)</sup>, for Ph. cannot possibly have mentioned  
 Phaleron as one of the twelve towns for the simple reason that it belonged  
 to the Tetrakomia <sup>8)</sup>. In my opinion Loeper found the correct solution:  
 the insertion of Τετράκωμοι after Τετράπολις is palaeographically easy;  
 the article of the 'Ρητορικῇ <sup>9)</sup>, though corrupt (or incomplete), proves  
 15 it to be right.

The belief reaching back to the fifth century B.C. that although Attica  
 always was a political as well as a geographical unit, its components  
 enjoyed self-administration until Theseus abolished this comparative  
 autonomy and gave the first constitution to the new state <sup>10)</sup>, was prob-  
 20 ably shared by all Atthidographers from Hellanikos downwards <sup>11)</sup>.  
 The synoikism of Theseus belongs to this belief <sup>12)</sup>, and it is fairly certain  
 that the number of twelve towns does so too, even if Thukydides omits  
 it because the number is unimportant for his thesis. What was of impor-  
 tance for him was the custom of the κατὰ τὴν χώραν αὐτόνομος οἰκησις <sup>13)</sup>,  
 25 which dated from primeval times and was not even changed by the  
 synoikism. The twelve and its derivatives are specifically Ionian (Athe-  
 nian) <sup>14)</sup>, and as to the towns of Kekrops the Parian Marble at least  
 proves that their number was earlier than Ph. <sup>15)</sup>. It is comprehensible  
 that it was the number twelve which first raised suspicion as to the  
 30 historical value of the tradition. Busolt <sup>16)</sup> declared it to be a 'versuch  
 die zustände Attikas vor der bildung der gesamtstaates auf grund von  
 sagen und unter anlehnung an noch bestehende kultverbände nach  
 analogie der ionischen zwölftstadt zu schematisiren'; Wilamowitz <sup>17)</sup> as  
 an 'akt der forschung, die, verführt durch das bestreben die vier phylen  
 35 und die zwölf trittyen örtlich zu fixiren, darauf vergeblich geschichtliche  
 kombinationen gebaut hat'. In opposition to these and similar suggestions  
 Hommel <sup>18)</sup> tried to save the historical character of the number twelve  
 by the thesis 'dass die altattische Dodekapolis des Philochoros ziemlich  
 unverfälscht die vorkleisthenischen zwölf trittyen Attikas biete'. Un-

fortunately not only the general foundations of this thesis are doubtful, our knowledge of the Cleisthenian order does not favour it. As a matter of fact only half of the twelve πόλεις of Ph. have until now recurred as names of trittyes<sup>19</sup>), five with documentary evidence (Epakria, Thorikos, 5 Sphettos, Eleusis, Tetrapolis), one (Aphidna) to be inferred<sup>20</sup>). If we assume with Hommel 27 Cleisthenian trittyes as being known—14 (13) with documentary evidence, 13 (14) to be inferred with more or less probability—there would be room for three only of the remaining six πόλεις in the Cleisthenian list. Hommel admits Kephisia, Dekeleia, 10 Phaleros—the last being more than doubtful as the name of a Cecropian πόλις—into his list which thus rises to 30 names, and tries to explain (not very convincingly) why Kleisthenes did not use the names of Kekropia, Brauron, Kytheros for naming trittyes<sup>21</sup>). This foundation for a thesis, the practical value of which would consist in its helping us to restore the 15 list of Kleisthenes, is really too narrow. Moreover, a fact which has recently come to our knowledge contradicts it finally in my opinion: we know now the name of one of the pre-Cleisthenian trittyes, and it neither appears among the twelve πόλεις nor is it the name of a place at all. In the sacrificial calendar, written in (or shortly after) 403/2 B.C., which Oliver 20 proved to be part of the re-publication of the sacred laws of Solon and thus of the new Athenian code of laws<sup>22</sup>), among the sacrifices offered every second year we read this: 'Ἐκατομβαιῶνος πέμπτη ἐπὶ δέκα ἐκ τῶν φυλοβασιλικῶν Γλεόντων (sic) φυλῆι Λευκοταινίων τριττύι οἷν λειπογνώμονα · ἱερώσυνα φυλοβασιλεῦσι νῶτον . . . . "Ἐκτη ἐπὶ δέκα<sup>23</sup>) ἐκ τῶν φυλοβασι- 25 λικῶν Γλεόντων φυλῆι Διὶ Φρατρίῳ καὶ Ἀθηναίαι Φρατρίαι βόε δύο λειπογνώμονε · ἱερώσυνα φυλοβασιλεῖ σκέλος. From the point of view of tradition, it is also necessary to contradict the thesis of Loeper<sup>24</sup>) which Sölders characterized as 'a brave attempt to save the tradition': he ascribes to the fragment of Ph. an almost inestimable historical value when he regards Ph.'s list 30 as an enumeration of the autonomous states originally existing on Attic soil. Without entering into Loeper's argument (to do so would amount to writing a history of Attica from its beginnings to the geometrical period and beyond) I shall simply state that Ph. does in fact not say what Loeper makes him say<sup>25</sup>). The starting-point of the Atthidographer, 35 on the contrary, is without doubt the united Attic state including even Eleusis<sup>26</sup>), i.e. historical conditions as they existed from the seventh century onward. We need not rack our brains about the constitution of this united state; it would even be wrong to expect precise legal definitions from Atthidographers; it is sufficient that it was Kekrops

who founded the twelve towns, and that Ph. thus naturally regarded him as the king of all Attica, as the Marmor Parium regarded Aktaios and later authors Ogygos <sup>27</sup>). What Ph. makes his Kekrops do, is in fact nothing but a reflex of the Cleisthenian (or a pre-Cleisthenian) organization of the state: his list, a result of historical speculation, is not meant to be an enumeration of the parts out of which the historical Attic state had grown, but of those into which an alleged very old administrative organization divided a state, which had been of the same size since primeval times, including the entire 'Akte'. Because of the very fact that from the information given by the Atthidographers frequently inferences have been, and sometimes must be, drawn to primitive conditions of the state and more particularly of its cults it is perhaps not superfluous to add a warning on principle: the method of research which in questions like these refers to literary tradition too often misjudges its character, exaggerating the amount of knowledge of historical facts and conditions which we can expect to find in it. There did not exist in the fourth century B.C. documentary tradition of any kind about the state of Athens reaching back beyond the seventh century B.C., and even for the seventh century it was altogether limited, consisting of speculations and inferences rather than of facts. For this very point F 94 is most typical. We have seen that no list of the pre-Cleisthenian trittyes is preserved; literary tradition does not supply any information about them apart from their number and their establishment at some time very long ago <sup>28</sup>). If their names had been mentioned in the laws of Solon the grammarians would have excerpted them and we should find at least one or the other of them in Hesychios; perhaps books about them would have been written as about the clans <sup>29</sup>) and the demes <sup>30</sup>). Tradition does not tell us anything about Solon having changed the organization and administration of the country; the absence of facts and names confirms the conclusion *e silentio* that he did not make any changes. One might think that research would have been able to establish a list of the trittyes or at least of the phratries as they were before Kleisthenes. This has obviously not been done, and it actually seems as if the Atthidographers were not much interested in this part of the πολιτεία <sup>31</sup>). Matters are not much better even in regard to the phylai although we are told at least the names of the four phylai of Ion and even hear about earlier names which they are said to have borne at the time of Kekrops and his successors—provided they are the same four phylai which, in view of the principles of name-giving, is not at all certain <sup>32</sup>). Thus there can be no doubt that in regard to the list

of the twelve towns things remain on the whole as stated by Busolt. Perhaps one can speak with even greater certainty: the list (which may have had more variants than we know of) is a mere construction built on the number twelve; Ph. (or whoever preceded him) selected twelve names from a greater number of well-known Attic places (there really were more than twelve<sup>33</sup>) which for reasons no longer recognizable he considered to be the oldest and which in his opinion must have made up the territory of ancient Attica, whether or not he dealt in detail with their extent and boundaries. We cannot discuss the individual 'townships' here because it would mean discussing the earliest history of the country. But we can venture the inference that he did not know anything about phylai and trittyes of Kekrops, or in positive terms that in this respect he agreed with Aristotle; and if that is true there is a possibility (if a vague one) of carrying back the construction of Ἀθῆν. F 5 to Andro-  
 10 tion. Πόλεις are neither phylai nor trittyes; the principle of organization ascribed to Kekrops is different from that ascribed to Ion, with whom Aristotle opens his list of μεταβολαί — τότε γὰρ πρῶτον εἰς τὰς τέτταρας  
 15 συνενεμήθησαν φυλάς, καὶ τοὺς φυλοβασιλέας κατέστησαν. Ph.'s list of the towns of Kekrops can the less have arisen from the wish 'to fix locally'  
 20 the old phylai and trittyes, as even the four phylai of Ion and the only trittys now known to us do not bear local names but personal or descriptive ones.

Καρῶν - Ἄονας] About the meaning and the purpose of this account, which has probably been abbreviated, cf. n. 10. One would like to know  
 25 how far Ph. gives new theories, or how far he follows Androton, whose copious account of the prehistory of Thebes (324 F 60) may have started from this early hostility. That Megara is lacking among the enemies needs no explanation: it was part of Attica at that time<sup>34</sup>). As to the Carians, it was the general assumption that they inhabited the islands  
 30 of the Aegaeon<sup>35</sup>); the chronological sequence given by Thukydides, in which the Carians preceded Minos<sup>36</sup>), was not. The connexion of the Carian warlike expeditions or predatory invasions with the foundation of (walled) cities by Kekrops, definitely creates the impression that Ph. consciously followed the description of conditions in Thukydides' Archaeo-  
 35 logy<sup>37</sup>). If this impression is correct it would furnish an indication as to the time, for the synchronism of Minos and Theseus is an established fact for Ph. and the *Attides* generally<sup>38</sup>), and even at Theseus' time Athens had no fleet<sup>39</sup>). The wording which speaks of the continental enemies as Βοιωτοί, οὓς ἐκάλουν Ἄονας, may very well belong to Ph.,



although Strabo abbreviated the account: the starting-point for Atthidographers always is the state of things at their own time, and the hereditary hostility between Boeotia and Attica agrees with the nature of the *Atthis*. The term further proves that Ph. understood by Aones the Boeotians generally (as Hellanikos and Thukydides probably did <sup>40</sup>), *i.e.* he treated the whole country as an old united state of the same order as Attica, while the more accurate ethnography of Hekataios (I F 119) enumerated them among the various barbarous tribes settled in Boeotia before the arrival of the Greeks. As the Aones were sometimes regarded as the old inhabitants of the district of Thebes, this facilitated the extending of the name to all Boeotians (like that of the *Κεχροπίδαι* and *Ἀθηναῖοι* to all Attica). There also exists a tradition (somehow comparable to that about the Pelasgians) according to which they had come from Attica <sup>41</sup>. It is most regrettable that we do not know whether Ph. (and other Atthidographers) discussed these questions and what their attitude was in regard to them. If the words *Βοιωτῶν οὐδ' ἐκάλουν Ἄονας* would allow of quite strict interpretation Ph. did not acknowledge any change in the population (apart at the utmost of Phoenician and Greek immigration) and thus gave barbarian ancestors to the historical Boeotians, whereas, in contrast to Herodotos, he carefully distinguished the autochthonous Athenians from the barbarian Pelasgians <sup>42</sup>. This does not appear at all impossible to me, but it is better to refrain from further speculations as being too uncertain in view of our restricted knowledge <sup>43</sup>. *Κεχροπία*] About the meaning of the name we observe a discrepancy in Atthidography: in the *Atthis* used by the Parian Marble the name applies to the whole country formerly called *Ἀκτική*, the name of the town probably being simply *Ἀθῆναι* <sup>44</sup>. As this name is lacking in Ph.'s list, he evidently regarded *Κεχροπία* as the 'chief town', the seat of the government of Kekrops, the later *Ἀθῆναι* <sup>45</sup>. He then must have assumed that at some time the name Kekropia was changed to Athens. When this happened and who made the change is hard to tell: the establishment of the Panathenaia and the synoikism of Theseus (both facts doubtless noted by Ph.) seem to be equally likely at first sight. Epic poetry does not contradict the later date, and there were Athenian books, most probably *Atthides* among them, which ascribed to Theseus not only the institution of the Panathenaia, but the naming of Athens as well, as two matters obviously belonging together <sup>46</sup>. But the evidence from Atthidography is poor, and general considerations about the quality of the tradition do not help much. As according to Ph. (F 8-9) and the prevailing tradition it

was already Erichthonios who established the Panathenaia <sup>47</sup>), the idea recurs that the name Ἀθῆναι (as in Mythography <sup>48</sup>) and elsewhere) was for him a matter of religious rather than of political import, being connected somehow with his conception of the history of cults in Athens.

5 Ph. gave, at least incidentally, a chronological sequence of the great gods: Kekrops established the cult of Kronos (F 97), under Amphiktyon Dionysos arrived (F 5), and Demeter (F 103/4) probably under Erechtheus. Consequently the institution of the cult of Zeus must fall in one of the post-Kekropian reigns <sup>49</sup>), and it does not appear credible that Ph. assumed a cult of Athena as early as at the time of her grandfather Kronos.

10 That according to him one of the daughters of Kekrops was 'priestess of Athena' (F 105/6) need not contradict, if only because the provenance of at least F 106 from the *Atthis* is doubtful. One does not always sufficiently realize that tradition by no means always begins the history

15 of Athenian cult with Athena; on the contrary tradition fluctuates rather oddly, for (apart from the priority of Poseidon in Mythography) the introduction of her cult (or of matters connected with it) is dated (1) at indefinite primeval times by Plutarch *De Daed.* (VII p. 49 Bern.)

20 ξύλινον δὲ τὸ τῆς Πολιάδος (*scil.* ἄγαλμα) ὑπὸ τῶν αὐτοχθόνων ἰδρυθὲν, ὃ μέχρι νῦν Ἀθηναῖοι διαφυλάττουσιν <sup>50</sup>) and Pausan. I, 26, 6 τὸ δὲ ἀγιάτατον ἐν κοινῶι πολλοῖς πρότερον νομισθὲν ἔτεσιν <ἦ> συνῆλθον ἀπὸ τῶν δῆμων ἐστὶν Ἀθηναῖς ἄγαλμα ἐν τῇ νῦν ἀκροπόλει, τότε δὲ ὀνομαζομένη πόλει· φήμη δὲ ἐς αὐτὸ ἔχει πεσεῖν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. (2) under Kekrops by (Africanus-)Eusebios *P. E.* 10, 9, 22 (and *Chron.* a. Abr. 460/6 = F 93)

25 πρῶτος δὲ Κέκροψ λέγεται Ζῆνα κεκλημέναι . . . καὶ πάλιν πρῶτος Ἀθηναῖς ἄγαλμα στήσασθαι <sup>51</sup>). (3) under Amphiktyon Justin. 2, 6, 8/9 *huic* (*scil.* *Cecropi*) *successit Cranaus, cuius filia Atthis regioni nomen dedit. post hunc Amphictyonides regnavit, qui primus Minervae urbem sacravit et nomen civitati Athenas dedit.* (4) under Erichthonios *Bibl.* 3, 190 ἐν δὲ τῷ

30 τεμένει τραφεῖς Ἐριχθόνιος ὑπ' αὐτῆς Ἀθηναῖς . . . τὸ ἐν ἀκροπόλει ξόανον τῆς Ἀθηναῖς ἰδρύσατο, καὶ τῶν Παναθηναίων τὴν ἑορτὴν συνεστήσατο. It is, perhaps, no use guessing, but in view of the fact that for Ph. Erichthonios was the founder of the Panathenaia (F 8/9) I should like to find Ph.'s opinion (not first pronounced by him) in the witness cited

35 last. The list given below at least does not contradict this suggestion; the testimonies of Herodotos and the Parian Marble may even favour it. As they deal not with the cult of Athena but with the name of her people they lead us to another, our last, question. If from the fact that the *Atthis* of the Parian Marble called the whole country *Κεκροπία* we inferred

correctly 'Αθῆναι as its name for the city, one has at least to ask whether the reverse will have to be assumed for Ph. who transferred the name *Κεκροπία* to the city, viz. that he called the land 'Αττική (or something like it) and its inhabitants 'Αθηναῖοι. I am afraid there is no definite answer. Neither F 92 nor F 94 tells us whether he had at all a name for the land before the reign of Kekrops; and if he had we not do know in which form ('Ακτή, 'Ακτική, 'Αττική) he gave it; whether and when he assumed a change in the form of the name to have taken place, or how he explained it. Only negatively it seems certain that he did not derive it from an eponymous hero Aktaios, since he did not acknowledge his existence (F 92); but it does not follow that for him Akte was already 'the peninsula' as it was for Apollodoros<sup>52</sup>). It is even more doubtful whether he connected the name 'Αθηναῖοι with 'Ακτική-'Αττική: our evidence, the remainder of which I group together in the following list, opens another, and perhaps more attractive, possibility—the derivation of 'Αθηναῖοι from 'Αθηνᾶ.

Herodt. 8, 44 <sup>53</sup> )	Marm. Par. A 1; 10	Paus. 1, 2, 6	Strab. 9, 1, 18 <sup>54</sup> )
(1) ἐπὶ Πελασγῶν 20 Κραναοί	(1) ἀπὸ 'Ακταίου 'Ακτική	(1) 'Ακταία (ἀπὸ 'Ακταίου)	(1) 'Ακτική ἀπὸ 'Ακταίωνος
(2) ἐπὶ Κέκροπος Κεκροπίδαι	(2) (ἀπὸ Κέκρο- πος) Κεκροπία	(2) 'Αττική (ἀπὸ 'Ατθίδος τῆς Κραναοῦ)	(2) 'Ατθίς καὶ 'Ατ- τική ἀπὸ 'Ατ- θίδος τῆς Κρα- ναοῦ, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ Κραναοὶ οἱ ἐνοί- κοι
(3) (ἐπὶ) 'Ερεχ- θέως 'Αθηναῖοι	(3) 'Εριχθόνιος 'Αθηναίους		(3) Μοψόπια ἀπὸ Μοψόπου (?)
(4) (ἐπὶ) 'Ιωνος 30 'Ιωνες	(4) ὠνόμασεν		(4) 'Ιωνία ἀπὸ 'Ιωνος (5-6) Ποσειδωνία καὶ 'Αθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπωνόμων θεῶν

35 (95) As the people in Attica is called δῆμος, λεῶς and λαοί being restricted to poetry, the account in this fragment evidently is a transposition of the well-known motif of the creation of men by Deukalion, which at the same time rationalizes the story. The *Atthis* of the Parian

Marble had moved Deukalion below the reign of Kekrops into that of the second king Kranaos and brought him to Athens, where he became the founder of the old sanctuary of Zeus, and where his tomb was shown <sup>1</sup>). There is no room for the λιθινος γόνος <sup>2</sup>) in this artificial legend which 5 is attached to the τέμενος Γῆς ἐπικλήσειν Ὀλυμπίας <sup>3</sup>). It is easy to understand why Thukyd. 2, 15, 4 did not mention Deukalion, though among the oldest sanctuaries he mentions that of the Olympian Zeus and that of Ge; but Theopompos (115 F 347) does not mention him either, and this omission makes it doubtful whether his connexion of the κατακλυσμός 10 with the Chytra can be used as *terminus ante* of the formation of the legend. I believe Phanodemos perfectly capable of claiming Deukalion for Athens <sup>4</sup>); it was easy to find the necessary monuments: any ancient tomb without a name <sup>5</sup>) would do. We cannot decide whether Ph. adopted this late invention (which he cannot have failed to recognize 15 as such); the use made of the motif of the creation of men from stones would not be decisive, as the transference of the story to Kekrops would not make the presence of Deukalion in Athens impossible. Eustath. on *Il.* A 10 relates side by side the ἱστορία of the census of Kekrops and the μῦθος of the creation of men by Deukalion; but I do not venture 20 to make an inference from him to Ph. Moreover, the transferring of a motif is quite different from the rationalization of a whole story, as seen e.g. in F 18 or F 104. Kekrops made the census (if πλεθυσθῆναι is correct) not from any interest in statistics, but as a starting-point for a deliberate policy of increasing the population, an assumption typical for Ph.s 25 conception of history. The number of 20000 citizens would be very high, but it is doubtful whether it refers to such; as the motif was borrowed from the Deukalion story women were presumably included <sup>6</sup>). Assuming them equal to the number of men we obtain the normal number of the πόλις μυριάνδρος, which is not essentially different from the number of 30 10800 resulting from the calculation of Aristotle (or Androtion?) in Ἰθρ. F 5.

(96) About the Ἐπιτομαί of Herakleides Lembos see Bloch *Transact. Am. Phil. Ass.* 71, 1940, p. 27 ff.; about Hermippos, who is not much earlier, see Heibges *RE* VIII col. 845 ff.; Christ-Schmid *Gr. Lit.* <sup>6</sup> II 35 p. 84; Adcock *Cambridge Hist. Journ.* 2, 1927. The series of Athenian legislators opens with Kekrops and Buzyges, who is also very old; it continues with Triptolemos <sup>1</sup>), Solon, and Kleisthenes <sup>2</sup>). For Triptolemos Hermippos gave the evidence of Xenokrates, for Buzyges that of Ph. and Lasos (it is more likely that he added the latter himself than that

he found him in Ph.). It is hardly doubtful that he also supplied evidence for Kekrops, but Herakleides did not excerpt any. Hermippos enumerated the individual measures, Herakleides appears to have summarized them briefly. Ph. seems to have regarded them as εῦρήματα and acts of civilization <sup>3)</sup>, not as νόμοι, though this would not preclude his counting the first laws among the 'inventions'. The Scholia on Aristoph. *Plut.* 773 (cf. p. 390, 14 ff.) state that Kekrops νόμους πολλοὺς ἐφεῦρε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ ἀπὸ ἀγριότητος <αὐτοῦς> εἰς ἡμερότητα ἤγαγεν, and make this one of the explanations of διφυής. This is not the explanation of Ph. The following innovations are ascribed to Kekrops, of which we cannot refer any to Ph. with certainty: Klearchos speaks of marriage (Athen. 13, 2 p. 555 D); *quidam* (Tac. *Ann.* 11, 14) of the art of writing; Nonnos (*Dionys.* 41, 383/4) of the yoking of two horses. Laws properly so called (for funerals) appear only in Cicero *De legg.* 2, 63. What Ph. recorded about <sup>10</sup> Buzyges is unfortunately entirely lost; it is also dubious whether F 96 is taken from the *Atthis* at all. He hardly called Kekrops 'legislator': νομοθετῆσαι belongs to the terminology of the compiler, who wrote several books Περὶ νομοθετῶν and collected as many names as possible. In Attic tradition Buzyges is even more decidedly a hero of civilization <sup>20</sup> than Kekrops is, although in a limited sphere which is indicated by his name <sup>4)</sup>; and what he lays down <sup>5)</sup> are not laws given to a single state but ordinances of general validity, sanctioned not by penalties but by the trespasser being anathemized by the priest. Our witnesses consistently avoid the term 'law' and speak of ἀραὶ <sup>6)</sup>.

<sup>25</sup> (97) Macrob. Sat. 1, 7, 36 *apparet Saturnalia vetustiora esse urbe Roma, adeo ut ante Romam <conditam?> in Graecia hoc solemne coepisse L. Accius in Annalibus suis referat his versibus: «maxima pars Graesum Saturno et maxime Athenae | conficiunt sacra, quae Cronia esse iterantur ab illis, | eumque diem celebrant: per agros urbesque fere omnes | exercent*  
<sup>30</sup> *epulis laeti famulosque procurant | quisque suos; nosterque itidem est mos traditus illinc | iste, ut cum dominis famuli epulentur ibidem»*. Accius, who was a scholar, takes this account from a Greek source which may be, but need not be (at least not directly), Ph. <sup>7)</sup> Athen. 14, 44/5 p. 639 B-640 A talks about the Roman custom ἐστιᾶν τοὺς οἰκέτας, αὐτοὺς τὰς τῶν <sup>35</sup> οἰκετῶν ἀναδεχομένους λειτουργίας at the Kronia (Saturnalia); he says 'Ἐλληνικὸν δὲ τοῦτο τὸ ἔθος, and quotes a number of Greek (and Oriental) parallels <sup>8)</sup>. He must have mislaid a slip containing the quotation from Ph., for the slight difference that Ph., as quoted by Macrobius, does not mention the slaves being served by their masters, perhaps even

excluding this feature by the wording *cum servis vesci*, would not have caused Athenaios to omit the chief evidence <sup>3</sup>): *maxime Athenae* says Accius.

The evidence of Ph. contains two facts: (1) the introduction of the  
 5 cult of Kronos and Rhea by Kekrops; (2) the institution of the festival,  
 which Accius calls Kronia. It falls on the twelfth day of the first Attic  
 month <sup>4</sup>), and Ph., too, most probably assumed that this month was  
 named Kronion at some earlier time <sup>5</sup>). I see no reason to doubt that  
 the two facts, which are closely connected, occurred in Ph., *i.e.* that  
 10 Macrobius' source furnished him with what he quotes under the name  
 of Ph. at the end of a sub-section <sup>6</sup>). The quotation is certainly not taken  
 from *Περὶ εὐρημάτων*, and probably not from *Περὶ ἐορτῶν*, where we  
 expect more details of the cult, above all the calendar date which could  
 have been used for supporting the thesis in the paragraph of Macrobius <sup>7</sup>);  
 15 it rather comes from the *Atthis*, where the statements, confined to the  
 essential points, would well fit the description of the reign of the first  
 king who organized the life of the community in all respects. As to his  
 religious innovations more attention should be paid to *primum* than  
 has been done: it shows that Ph. regarded the cult of Kronos-Rhea as  
 20 the oldest cult of the state, and that this couple stands first among the  
 great gods who were introduced in the course of time by later kings <sup>8</sup>).  
*Saturno et Opi primum in Attica statuisset aram* corresponds to οὗτος  
 πρῶτος βοῦν ἔθυσσε καὶ Ζῆνα προσηγόρευσεν ὡς τινας in the non-Philochorean  
 part of F 93 <sup>9</sup>), and it signifies also in regard to the sacrifices offered a  
 25 considerable difference of opinion between Ph. and the *Atthis* from  
 which Eusebios ultimately derives and which we cannot determine. It  
 was the same *Atthis* which called the town of Kekrops Athenai, whereas  
 its name in Ph. was Kekropia <sup>10</sup>).

Here we come upon the only real difficulty of the fragment, *viz.* the  
 30 meaning of the words *eosque deos pro Jove Terraque coluisse*. The exception  
 taken by Wilamowitz <sup>11</sup>) to them either is altogether unjustified or it  
 misses the point. Judging from the learned nature of Macrobius' source  
 it is really not credible that the translator made the elementary blunder  
 of misunderstanding a 'local' *πρὸ Διὸς καὶ Γῆς*, and the interpretation  
 35 that this alleged wording of Ph. 'referred to the fact of the temple of  
 Kronos and Rhea being situated close to the Olympieion and the temenos  
 of Γῆ Ὀλυμπία; Pausan. I, 18, 7' <sup>12</sup>) is wrong in two ways: (1) no Greek  
 would have expressed this meaning in this manner (at the least it would  
 have to be *πρὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ Διὸς*); and (2) Pausanias distinctly states

that the old monuments which he enumerates are situated *in* the περιβολος of the ἱερὸν τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Ὀλυμπίου, which for Pausanias dates from the time of Hadrian. Wilamowitz seems to have felt his mistake himself, for he follows up the words just quoted with the statement that 'Ph. declared the cult of Kronos to be older', and Deubner<sup>13</sup>) therefore understood the assumed πρό in the temporal sense as 'before'. This is unobjectionable linguistically, but would make the mistake of the translator even more incredible. The explanation of *pro* ('in the place of') must be found otherwise: Ph. had mentioned the Kronia in a context in which the excerptor (being only concerned with the parallel of a typical feature to the Saturnalia) was not particularly interested; he therefore merely indicated the context. This context was not the sequence in time of the Athenian gods; F 98, where the πρώτον is followed by a ὕστερον does not furnish a parallel; in the case of a chronological sequence Martianus<sup>14</sup> would have written *pro Jove et Junone*. Also, neither a mistake nor a misreading ("Ἡρας instead of Γῆς) nor a deliberate correction of a supposed error of the source by the learned translator appears very credible. It seems far more probable that Wilamowitz was on the right way, *i.e.* that Ph. in his survey of the cultic institutions of Kekrops actually made a local statement such as we now read in Pausanias, writing perhaps thus: καὶ πρῶτος βωμὸν κατεσκεύασε Κρόνῳ καὶ Ῥέαι ὑπὸ τὴν πόλιν, ἔπου νῦν τὸ τοῦ Διὸς ἱερὸν καὶ τὸ τέμενος τῆς Γῆς, καὶ ἑορτὴν κατεστήσατο ἐν ἧι μετὰ τὴν συγκομιδὴν τῶν καρπῶν σὺν τοῖς οὐκέταις κτλ.<sup>14</sup>). The translator contracted this into *pro Jove Terraque*, and the nonsense as though Kekrops had replaced an existing cult of Zeus and Ge by that of Kronos and Rhea is the consequence of this abbreviation; even a learned translator may be capable of such a mistake.

The material for Kronos has been collected very fully by Max. Mayer *Rosch. Lex.* II 1 col. 1452 ff. and Pohlenz *N. Jahrb.* 1916 I p. 549 ff.; *R E XI* col. 1982 ff. We cannot and need not touch here upon the modern problem concerning the nature of Kronos and the age of his cult<sup>15</sup>), because it would not yield anything in regard to Ph. For him the god was a given fact because of the existence of a temple, the festival of the Kronia, and probably because of other indications<sup>16</sup>); his time was determined by his being the father of Zeus in Greek theology throughout. As the cult continued to exist the inference was obvious that it had been introduced by the first king Kekrops. It may remain an open question whether and how Ph. dealt with the cult(s) of the νομάδες καὶ σποράδην ζῶντες of F 2<sup>17</sup>). That he noted as belonging to the Kronia a custom

which had been preserved in historical times<sup>18</sup>) was natural in view of the implications of the festival, *viz.* the introduction of agriculture. It is not a sign of his having regarded the earliest times as the golden age. The contrary is proved by F 2 as well as by F 97 and the description of the civilizing activity of Kekrops: the ἐπὶ Κρόνου βλος is not merely different from the ἐπὶ Κέκροπος βλος, the two have no relation to each other<sup>19</sup>). The reason which Ph. gives for this particular custom (it would be suitable for other festivals as well)—*delectari enim deum e.g.s.*—does not apply specifically to the cult of Kronos, and perhaps is not actually 'theological' at all; it may show a 'Hesiodean' valuation of work or/and a humane disposition of mind which includes the slaves, and which is specifically Athenian<sup>20</sup>). What is essential is not the reason given, but the nature of the cult: *frugibus et fructibus coactis* surely does not only determine the date, the words indicate that the *primitiae* of the harvest were offered to Kronos, and consequently that bloodless sacrifices represent the earliest stage of Attic cult. Ph. probably did not discuss (at least not in the *Atthis*) an assumption widespread at his time about the development of Greek sacrificial customs, he is showing simply, and perhaps implicitly<sup>21</sup>), that the assumption is correct for Athens. That is confirmed by F 98 and the Buphonia legend which for ancient thinking proved a transition inside the same cult, *viz.* the cult of Zeus<sup>22</sup>). Of course, all kinds of variants existed. We have mentioned above the account of an *Atthis* which ascribed to Kekrops himself the first sacrifice of an ox for Zeus<sup>23</sup>), and on the other hand that the same Kekrops established the bloodless cult of Zeus Hypatos on the Akropolis<sup>24</sup>), a piece of information again hardly taken from Ph., for whom the connexion of Kekrops with Kronos is characteristic, perhaps as a simple consequence of his rejection of the list of pre-Cecropian kings. Nor can any other tradition concerning creations of cults by Kekrops be carried back to Ph. with any degree of certainty<sup>25</sup>); the first burnt offering for Athena<sup>26</sup>) and the dedication of an image of Hermes in the temple of Polias<sup>26</sup>) are impossible for him, if according to his *Atthis* the cult of Athena was introduced by one of the later kings.

(98) The quotation is preceded by one of Hellanikos (4 F 189) about the invention of the [σιδηρ]ᾶ ἄπλα by a Scythian king and followed by a section about the invention and development of the shield for which no author is quoted. It can hardly be decided whether the Chrestomathy, which is from the late Hellenistic period (if not from Roman times), took its notes from Heurematographers, or grouped them together without



such an intermediate source. There existed *Heuremata* of Ph., but the fact may as well be taken from the *Atthis* which described the conditions of civilization existing in early Attica or rather the contributions towards civilization of the creator and first king of the state. Again Ph. probably did not ask whether and what arms the *σποράδην ζῶντες* used when they were raided by the Carians and Aonians. The equipment introduced by Kekrops was not primitive <sup>1)</sup>, though of an early kind. The spear probably was still made entirely of wood—in the text the epithet apparently dropped out or the excerptor omitted it <sup>2)</sup>—its point hardened in fire <sup>3)</sup>.  
 10 *Περίβολή* cannot mean in this context (as it frequently does) the clothing, but the shield as the only protective weapon, the *καλὸν λαισήιον πρόβλημα χρωτός* of the *Hybrias skolion* <sup>4)</sup>, simply called *βοῦς* in the very old verse of the *Iliad* (H 238 οἶδ' ἐπὶ δεξιᾷ, οἶδ' ἐπὶ ἀριστερᾷ ναμῆσαι βῶν <sup>5)</sup>); when the Chrestomathy notes that *τινὲς ἱστοροῦσιν πρότερον τὰς ἀσπίδας περὶ*  
 15 *τοὺς ἄμους περιβαλλομένων* it means the time before handles, loops, bars *etc.* were invented. The heurematographers and the excerptor of *P. Ox.* 1241 grouped together arms for attack and for defence in this natural sequence. Here as elsewhere (as for instance in the claim to being the first town or to the earliest appearance of Demeter) Argos  
 20 competes with Athens <sup>6)</sup>. The tradition of Argos is more abundant, but almost throughout anonymous, a fact which hardly tells in favour of its antiquity, although as early a writer as Hellanikos wrote *Argolika* (4 F 36). Thus we cannot decide whether Ph. was refuting these claims. In any case, he probably was interested not so much in controversy of that  
 25 kind, as in the history of the development not only of armour but of matters of cult connected with it, for apparently it was not the compiler who put together different passages, but Ph. who anticipated (as he frequently did) by ὕστερον. Certain also that men who applied themselves to hunting did not only use the hide of wild animals, they ate their flesh  
 30 as well, not being vegetarians as their gods were, or at least the chief gods of Kekrops' time, Kronos and Rhea. But here, too, it remains uncertain whether Ph. dealt systematically with this question in the *Atthis* <sup>7)</sup>.

(99-101) These fragments belong together and are taken from the *Atthis* which in any case had to deal with the Pelasgians <sup>1)</sup>. We may  
 35 further assume that the Pelasgians were discussed under Kekrops, although we have no actual dates <sup>2)</sup>: F 99 seems to point to the story of the building of the Pelargikon, and as in Ph.'s opinion (F 94) it was Kekrops who founded the *πόλις* his Pelasgians cannot be pre-Kekropian as the primeval Pelasgians of Herodotos were. According to F 99 they

came to Attica from without, and their sojourn, according to F 100, was of short duration; their expulsion, therefore, may have taken place still in the time of Kekrops, to whom Atthidography gave a very long reign. These considerations lead us to suggest a digression, probably at  
5 the mention of the building of the wall, which, on its part, belongs to the foundation of the town. The extent of this digression was definitely limited by the length of the second book, which probably extended from Kekrops to, perhaps, Solon: in the concise language of a chronicle it need not even have been as long as Herodotos' appendix about the  
10 quest of Lemnos by Miltiades (6, 137-140). It is not probable, if only for these reasons, that the digression contained a systematic treatment of the whole problem of the Pelasgians. The Atthidographer had to deal with the Pelasgians in Attica, and he obviously merely had to answer the questions how they came to Attica, what they did there, and what  
15 became of them. The three fragments do not give a full answer to these questions, we derive from them only the following facts: (1) the Pelasgians, being in some way identical with the Tyrsenians and Sintians, are immigrants into Athens (from where we do not learn); (2) their sojourn in the country is short and ends in a bloody conflict with the Athenians;  
20 (3) the survivors escape to Lemnos and Imbros; (4) (later on, and starting from these islands?) they carry off Athenian women from Brauron. Not even this arrangement of the facts is guaranteed by the fragments; it is based on inferences from the remaining tradition, which we must needs discuss in order to understand the arrangement<sup>3</sup>). This cannot  
25 be done quite briefly, because we cannot confine ourselves exclusively to the 'Attic' Pelasgians.

The tradition about these, it is true, is a whole, which can easily be set apart<sup>4</sup>). Nevertheless we cannot deal with it neglecting the general background, *viz.* the tradition about the 'primeval Pelasgians', as I  
30 shall call them with a convenient term which distinguishes them from the 'primeval Hellenes', the later Dorians; for we cannot simply declare (though I believe it to be true) that the former tradition is independent of the general tradition and of purely Athenian origin, whereas the tradition about the primeval Pelasgians, the 'Pelasgian question' proper, belongs  
35 to the realm of Great Historiography and was raised first by those whom Herodotos (7, 94/5) quotes terminologically as "Ἕλληνες. The problem of that general tradition is easy to formulate, and it may be useful to formulate it, because recent scholars, particularly historians and even more philologists, tend to use the name of Pelasgians again for the pre-Greek, pre-

Indogermanic, or even the early Greek population. In view of the clear state of tradition it is not unobjectionable to do so, and in any case not recommendable <sup>5</sup>). It is well known that the Greeks had no recollection of their own immigration, but they did perceive from the first that the traditional partition into three tribes of Ionians, Dorians, Aeolians, was not sufficient for explaining the ethnic conditions of the mother country, about which alone they were concerned, for Asia Minor was always understood to be a country colonized later <sup>6</sup>). Apart from the questions concerning shiftings of peoples and the nationalities of the historical districts, the outcome of this perception was the fundamental distinction of two layers of population, one Greek and one not-Greek (barbarian); the latter was illogically regarded as being (or was felt to be) earlier. This earlier population was by no means regarded as uniform, but like the Greeks divided into a number of tribes or peoples <sup>7</sup>). Among the barbarian peoples, the Pelasgians undoubtedly play a prominent part in Greece proper: although the tradition became more and more confused by hypotheses and combinations the difference of the Pelasgians from the Carians (particularly those from the islands) and from the Leleges (particularly those of Asia Minor) stands out clearly. It must, however, be understood that the Pelasgians, too, do not stand in an equally close connexion with every region; the name obviously gained ground, and from being originally a Thessalian people they finally became the primeval inhabitants of all Hellas <sup>8</sup>). This is important also for the historical valuation of the Attic tradition.

<sup>25</sup> The main problem of the Attic story can be set forth equally simply: the tradition is seemingly voluminous, fixed, and old, but—in contradistinction to the Arcadian, Argive, and particularly to the Thessalian group of traditions—it is remarkable at first sight that the Attic list of kings does not contain a Pelasgos, let alone his standing at its head. <sup>30</sup> The name of the Athenian *αὐτόχθων* and *γηγενής* is never Pelasgos, it is Aktaios, Kekrops, or Erechtheus (Erichthonios), and although the second name has sometimes been declared to be barbarian it has never been stated to be Pelasgian, as far as we know, and if this had been stated we should know it <sup>9</sup>). In order to characterize completely the Attic tradition <sup>35</sup> it may be added at once that the great mass of evidence about Pelasgians in Attica can on closer inspection be reduced to two incidents or local stories; (1) the story of the wall-building Pelasgians on Hymettos (A); (2) that of the women-raping Pelasgians at Brauron (B). The fundamental condition for understanding them is to keep the two stories apart for

the present <sup>10</sup>), not to interpolate anything into them from each other or from elsewhere. In other words: the two pieces of evidence which are not only the earliest but relatively old as well, must be interpreted accurately and without preconceived opinions. We shall begin with 5 story A which is concerned with the old *πόλις* and which will prove to be not merely the earlier, but the only real story of the Pelasgians at Athens. As its authority Herodotos cites the Milesian Hekataios <sup>11</sup>). It is a rare stroke of good fortune that he mentioned his source at all, and that his subsequent criticism guarantees his having given the story 10 complete at least in the fundamental lines. What Hekataios related was nothing but the story of the earliest fortification of the Akropolis, which the later Attidographers (as far as we know them) unanimously regarded as a work of the Pelasgians. The Pelasgians came to Attica (whence Hekataios does not say), built the wall round the Akropolis, received as 15 their reward land on Hymettos, and were expelled again by the Athenians whose envy was roused by the Pelasgians' admirable cultivation of the land <sup>12</sup>) (Hekataios again does not say where they went). This story is simple, rounded off, and complete in itself; we are not justified in finding 'gaps' to be filled from later sources. All that is required is mentioned: 20 the Akropolis and the abode of the Pelasgians on Hymettos <sup>13</sup>), which proves the Attic (or more accurately and more correctly) the Athenian origin of the story. The restriction to the seat of the king; the absence of proper names of localities outside Attica for the geographical determination of the Pelasgians, and of dates; the naivety which accepts the reason 25 for the expulsion as a matter of course <sup>14</sup>), all these points are so many witnesses to the antiquity of the story and its popular and legendary character. The story is bound up with an Athenian monument; it is aitiological, giving the answer to the question as to who created the miraculous work of the 'Cyclopien' citadel-wall, and it is typical in this 30 respect <sup>15</sup>). This origin explains at once why the invention of a king Pelasgos starting from this legend would have been as unnatural as a king *Kyklops* in Mykene, while it may remain an open question (probably to be answered in the negative) whether the legend was interested in the origin of the Pelasgians and in their fate once they were expelled 35 from Athens <sup>16</sup>). In any case, it is quite wrong to ascribe the invention of a legend of this type to Hekataios <sup>17</sup>). The only credible hypothesis is that the Milesian adopted an Athenian legend, and nothing tells against the 'great traveller' having heard this legend in Athens himself <sup>18</sup>). In any case, it belongs to the sixth century at the latest, and may be

considerably older; and it is interesting because the natural prejudice, which seeks at least a historical nucleus in these old legends, can be refuted in this case: a wall built by the Pelasgians ought to be called Πελασγικόν, and is indeed called thus *e.g.* in the *Atthis* of the Parian Marble; but the official name, nearly always used by earlier authors down to Ph., is Πελαργικόν<sup>19</sup>). The wrong form (Πελασγικόν) can hardly be doubted to be popular etymology, such as frequently occurs in legends if a name does not admit of an immediate explanation; and nothing would be altered if the inventors of the legend (for a legend has an author as surely as a popular song, though we do not know him) were λόγοι ἄνδρες who knew about the Pelasgians of 'Hesiod'. This fact may allow of a *terminus post* for the legend, but it is a very uncertain point of time, Pelasgos or the Pelasgians being a given concept of genealogical poetry. Much later than the legend, which Hekataios passed on innocently, is, of course, the correction which Herodotos attributes to 'the Athenians'. If it is made on the spur of the moment to answer a question of Herodotos (and this assumption is obvious in regard to apologetic corrections like these) it cannot be older than about 445 B.C.

We turn to the story B, the rape of the women at Brauron by the Pelasgians of Lemnos, the first, and one might say the only, authority for which is Herodotos (6, 138-140; cf. 4, 145, 2). The difference of this 'Brauronian' story from the legend A relating to the walls of the Akropolis is as evident as its resemblance to the Athenian correction of the latter; both are inventions of a deliberately apologetic tendency, and nobody has ever doubted that B is meant to justify the Athenian conquest of Lemnos and the expulsion of its inhabitants<sup>20</sup>). That dates its origin in the last decade of the sixth century B.C.<sup>21</sup>). The justification consists in a raid made by the Lemnians on Brauron at a remote time, and the story is fabricated cheaply with motifs always ready at hand—violation of a festival, divine punishment by making the land sterile, enquiry in Delphi, typical answer δίκας δίδοναι. The explanation why the expiation was performed so late alone shows some originality, but it also reveals indisputably when and for what purpose the whole story was invented<sup>22</sup>).

This second story is quite as complete and self-contained as the legend of the Pelargikon. The inventor of it, the 'chief of the propaganda service' of Miltiades, had no reason to enter into the previous history of the Lemnian 'Pelasgians'; on the contrary, if he knew the legend about the Pelasgians of Hymettos in the form in which Hekataios found it in Athens he did far better to leave aside an event which put the old Athenians

in a rather unfavourable light. Actually he was spared this dilemma, because in his view the Lemnian brigands were not Pelasgians at all, but Tyrsenians<sup>23</sup>). To combine the legend with the tendencious invention into one of those serial stories frequent in Herodotos by means of identifying the Lemnian ravishers with the Pelasgians of Hymettos was not possible until the account of Hekataios had been contradicted by Herodotos' Athenian authority, who alleged attacks on the water-fetching maidens of Athens analogous to the rape of the participants in the festival at Brauron. The form of the criticism of Hekataios does not, in my opinion, leave the smallest doubt that it was Herodotos himself who put this λόγος before his Athenian friends, and was doubly satisfied with their answer because it completely exonerated Athens and at the same time convicted Hekataios of inaccuracy. It was Herodotos who combined the two independent stories, the legend of the Pelargikon and the justification of the claim of Athens to Lemnos, into one whole, and it was Herodotos who identified the Pelasgian builders of the wall of the Akropolis with the predatory inhabitants of Lemnos, thus assigning to them a consistent character foreign from them as well in the remaining tradition as elsewhere in Herodotos himself<sup>24</sup>).

If this hypothesis is correct we are able to solve the real difficulty in the tradition about the Attic Pelasgians, *viz.* their identification with the Tyrsenians of Lemnos. This difficulty<sup>25</sup>) can best be perceived by a comparison of Herodotos and Ph.: in Herodotos the builders of the wall as well as the inhabitants of Lemnos expelled by Miltiades are simply Pelasgians; there is no indication of doubts or variants in the tradition about their origin and their nationality such as we so frequently find in him. They are not Tyrsenians and could not be because those (again without any indication of a divergent tradition<sup>26</sup>)) have wandered in remote times from Lydia to the West ἐς Ὀμβρικοῦς where they founded towns and were living at Herodotos' own time. Contrariwise in Ph., according to the most detailed (but by no means full) F 100, the immigrants to Athens, who lived there but for a short time, *are* Tyrsenians. There is no difficulty in arranging the two shorter fragments 99 and 101 with F 100 into an orderly narrative: as after the bloody clash between the Athenians and these Tyrsenians the remnants of the latter occupy Lemnos and Imbros, and as from there they harry Athens abducting virgins at the Brauronian festival, they are identical with the Pelasgians of F 101, who do the same and from this event *are called* Sinties<sup>27</sup>). Nor can there be any doubt as to the reason which in the first instance

brought the Tyrsenians-Pelasgians(-Sinties) to Athens and as to their activity there; the only serious gap in their 'prehistory', obvious in F 99 and F 100, is easily filled: the immigrants, whom the Athenians called Pelargoi (for the context shows that this form of the name must be assumed for Ph. in F 99: they are *called* thus because of their arrival in ships with white sails and because of the season), must be the builders of the Pelargikon, which after the expulsion alone preserved their name in Athens. The tribe with which Ph. deals in the three fragments has one nationality (they are Tyrsenians), but several names at different times and at different places<sup>28</sup>), and this is the main fact which distinguishes the report of Ph. from those of his predecessors. Again there is no doubt who these predecessors were: Ph. knew the account in the sixth book of Herodotos, and made it the foundation of his own story of the building of the Athenian Akropolis, but he did not content himself with Herodotos; acting as a scholar must in a question so much discussed he also consulted the source quoted by Herodotos and probably other writers (Hellenikos for choice and perhaps Kleidemos). When Herodotos' Athenian authority virtuously declared ἐνωτοὺς δὲ γενέσθαι τοσοῦτοι ἐκείνων ἀνδρας ἀμείνονας ὄσωι παρεὸν αὐτοῖσι ἀποκτεῖναι τοὺς Πελαγοὺς, ἐπεὶ σφέας ἔλαβον ἐπι-  
 20 βουλευόντας, οὐκ ἐθέλησαι, ἀλλὰ σφι προειπεῖν ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐξιέναι, it seems evident that the source which he criticised just said what the Athenians said they did not, *viz.* that when driven by sheer envy they deprived the Pelasgians of their land on Hymettos, they also killed at least part of them<sup>29</sup>). This is precisely what we hear from Ph. who  
 25 combines with it the Athenian justification of their own conduct as related by Herodotos: ὠφθησαν ἐπανιστάμενοι τῇ πόλει, καὶ πολλοὶ μὲν αὐτῶν ἀπώλοντο ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων, ἄλλοι δὲ ἐκφυγόντες κτλ. Comparing the evidence we may infer (even if cautiously at first) that Ph.'s second source Hekataios, while like Herodotos calling the builders of the city-wall  
 30 Pelasgians, gave the name 'Tyrsenians' to the Lemnian ravishers<sup>30</sup>). This inference would be corroborated by the analysis of Herodotos' narrative which led us to the opinion that he arbitrarily united two independent stories by equating the Pelasgians on Hymettos with the Lemnians at Brauron; and we may regard the inference as being  
 35 certain because it (and it alone) enables us to understand the whole of the tradition about the Pelasgians in Attica and Lemnos<sup>31</sup>). Confining ourselves to the most important points we now make the following statements:

(1) Ph. was not the first to reconcile a contradictory tradition by means of

distinguishing the name of a people from its nationality<sup>33</sup>), explaining the change of name from migrations and the like. The facts that Sophokles speaks of the inhabitants of Argolis as Τυρσηνοῖσι Πελασγοῖς<sup>33</sup>), and that Thukydides mentions on the Athos peninsula ξύμμεικτα ἔθνη 5 βαρβάρων διγλώσσων, particularly τὸ Πελασγικόν, τῶν καὶ Λῆμόν ποτε καὶ Ἀθήνας Τυρσηνῶν οἰκησάντων<sup>34</sup>), point with a high degree of probability to some distinguished author who connected the two names; and it is at least very likely that this was Hellanikos, who first brought into a system the traditions about the Pelasgians, and whose regard for Herodotos is unmistakable. It is useless to call this an 'arbitrary pseudo-system'<sup>35</sup>), though it is that actually from the point of view of the modern 10 historian. It is more important to state that Hellanikos' principle of research does not aim at criticism of the tradition, but at collecting and reconciling it by a theory which united all the former data. Herodotos' 15 identification certainly was arbitrary, but Herodotos as well as Hekataios was an authority for Hellanikos, and it is a principle valid almost throughout ancient research (later authors simply enumerate) to accept authoritative opinions if they cannot be proved wrong, and to reconcile them somehow with other authoritative opinions. It hardly happens 20 that a thesis once stated disappears from discussion; if the authoritative views are very divergent (as is the case with the Pelasgians) there gradually arises a 'knot of hypotheses' by the numerous attempts at reconciliation; but if one takes into account that principle of ancient research one can perhaps disentangle the knot fairly easily.

25 (2) A number of authors do not mention Tyrseians and Pelasgians, but one of the two peoples only. As to the historians we seldom have a full knowledge of their views; the poets are in a position to select according to their liking: Apollonios' *Σιντηίδα Λῆμον* (*Argon.* I, 608; 4, 1760) is always possible because of the Homeric Sintians who, in fact, provide 30 no more difficulties than the 'Minyans', because both these peoples come from another sphere than that of the Pelasgians and Tyrseians, *viz.* from epic poetry<sup>36</sup>); Kallimachos' *Τυρσηνῶν τεύχος Πελασγικόν* (F 97 Pf.), however, probably is simply Ph. But it should be noticed that hardly any of the earlier authors simply follows Herodotos, whereas Tyrseians 35 on Lemnos are mentioned by all kinds of authors of the fourth century and later<sup>37</sup>). As far as we can see Herodotos' arbitrary action has never been expressly refuted; on the contrary, the intricate tradition about the nationality of the wall-builders is his fault, and his fault alone, for he did not by any means succeed in superseding the evidence of



Hekataios about the nationality of the inhabitants of Lemnos. Almost the opposite is the case: because Herodotos, in consequence of his apology for Athens, made the Tyrsenians of Lemnos Pelasgians, conversely the Attic Pelasgians were made Tyrsenians already by Thukydides and later by Ph., or (perhaps more correctly,) were called Tyrsenians as a branch of the Pelasgians.

(3) Points (1) and (2) actually affect the Athenian part of the Pelasgian question alone. Because this is a self-contained group we could leave aside the general Pelasgian problem, and even now we need enter into it only

10 so far as Herodotos' main theory about the Pelasgians (which will prove to be the theory of Ionian genealogy and ethnology) touches Athens, too, and even Athens in particular. This main and general theory also occurs in a digression, but at a far more prominent place near the opening of the whole work (1, 56-58)<sup>38</sup>); and in this digression

15 Herodotos, starting more from the conditions of his own time than from those of Croesus' days<sup>39</sup>), develops his views of the ethnic character of the Greek people. This digression is not easy to understand (which may also be a sign of its not containing anything essentially new), but its structure is clear: (a) Lacedaemonians and Athenians are defined

20 (politically and) ethnically as the leading states of the Δωρικόν and the Ἴωνικόν γένος. (b) Originally (τὸ ἀρχαῖον) the Ionians were a Πελασγικόν, the Dorians a Ἑλληνικόν ἔθνος<sup>40</sup>). (c) The Pelasgians are a resident people<sup>41</sup>), the Dorians a migratory one which, passing through a series of places from its primeval home Phthiotis (which, it must be noted,

25 is not called Thessalian), eventually ἐς Πελοπόννησον ἐλθὼν Δωρικὸν ἐκλήθη. (d) The Pelasgians are barbarians, for their language is barbarian, as is inferred from the scattered remains of the people; consequently the Athenians (that is what the whole syllogism results in), who are a Pelasgian people, must have changed their language ἅμα τῇ μεταβολῇ τῇ ἐς

30 Ἑλλάδας. It must be emphasized that in this syllogism the decisive words τὸ Ἀττικὸν ἔθνος ἐὼν Πελασγικόν would be a mere *petitio principii* if one does not bear in mind that for Herodotos here and elsewhere the Pelasgians are just the primeval inhabitants of Hellas (with the exception of the 'Hellenic' Phthiotis), Hellas being the ancient Pelasgia. If one is

35 clear about this, one also understands the expression ἀποσχισθὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ Πελασγικοῦ, used of the Dorians, though it may not be very happy; it sounds as if the Dorians, too, had originally been Pelasgians, an idea at once precluded by ch. 56, 2<sup>42</sup>). (e) The Hellenes, however, have always spoken the Greek language, *i.e.* they never were barbarians

(I, 58). This conclusion <sup>43</sup>), which takes up the antithesis of the opening sentence (έόντα τὸ ἀρχαῖον τὸ μὲν Πελασγικόν, τὸ δὲ Ἑλληνικόν ἔθνος I, 56, 2), and comprehensively states the different development of the two ethnical groups, need not detain us here <sup>44</sup>).

5 The first question concerning the theory here developed is whether, or how far, it is Herodotos' own idea, the second what was the attitude of Atthidography towards it. The answer to the first question is not quite simple; but I have no doubt that it must be mainly negative, *i.e.* that in the digression about the nationality of the Greeks we are  
 10 dealing not with a theory of Herodotos but with one put forward by Ionian science <sup>45</sup>). Of the three points—(a) the Greek people (Hellenes in the wider sense of the word) contains two ethnical components, *viz.* Hellenes (in the narrower sense, *i.e.* Helleno-Dorians, primeval or true Hellenes) and Pelasgians; (b) the Pelasgians are barbarians; (c) the  
 15 Athenians were Pelasgians and have been hellenized in the course of time—the two first, which are decisive for the theory, are certainly not new; we can trace them in Hekataios. Strabo <sup>46</sup>) quotes his thesis διότι πρὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὠκίησαν αὐτὴν (*scil.* τὴν Πελοπόννησον) βάρβαροι, σχεδὸν  
 20 δέ τι καὶ ἡ σύμπασα Ἑλλάς κατοικία βαρβάρων ὑπῆρξε τὸ παλαιόν, and subsequently gives a detailed report. This report shows (a) that Hekataios did not mention Pelasgians only, they are merely one tribe of barbarians among many; there were the 'people' whom Pelops brought with him from Phrygia (it is expressly said ἐπαγόμενον λαόν), and Danaos from Egypt, the Dryopes, Kaukones, Pelasgians, Leleges, 'and others of that  
 25 kind who were living in the Peloponnese and also outside' <sup>47</sup>). It is a deliberate one-sidedness of Herodotos that at first he considers exclusively the Pelasgians, for when he finally explains the increase of τὸ Ἑλληνικόν by the addition (*i.e.* hellenization) of Pelasgians and 'numerous other barbarian peoples', it seems obvious that what he gives  
 30 is merely an abridgement (and at the same time an adaptation to his main purpose) of Hekataios' detailed enumeration which furnished particulars about the several regions of Greece <sup>48</sup>). (b) That Hekataios took the language into account: he gave a proof ἀπὸ τῶν ὀνομάτων; Kekrops, Kodros, Aiklos and others are barbarian names. The wording  
 35 of Herodotos' elaborate proof of the fact that the Pelasgians spoke a barbarian language, founded as it is on the language of some Pelasgian remnants *outside Greece proper* (I, 57, I-2), seems to show that (as he frequently does) he added something to the thesis of Hekataios from his own knowledge. (c) That the linguistic argument was not the only one

used by Hekataios. It was preceded by the 'historical' proof ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῶν μνημονευομένων: tradition told of the immigration of Pelops and Danaos into the Peloponnese, of Kadmos to Thebes, of Thracians to Athens <sup>49</sup>). A further argument, possibly put at the end because it was  
 5 the most striking one (which is very characteristic of Hekataios' mode of thinking), was furnished by the conditions of his own time: μέχρι νῦν Hellas is not only surrounded by barbarian peoples, a not inconsiderable part of Hellas itself is held by barbarians <sup>50</sup>).

If the conclusion drawn from Strabo's report on Hekataios as well as  
 10 from Herodotos' own wording is correct, we understand at once the seeming *petitio principii* of the 'Ἀττικὸν ἔθνος ἐὼν Πελασγικόν <sup>51</sup>) on the one side and the elaborate linguistic proof for the barbarian nationality of the Pelasgians on the other, as well as the succinctness of the whole account and the difficulties we have in understanding it: Herodotos uses  
 15 for his historical purpose an earlier Ionian theory, inserting it in the form of a digression at a place which he deemed suitable <sup>52</sup>), and he adapts the theory to the particular theme of this digression, the relative strength of Ionians and Dorians. The fact with which we actually are concerned alone is thus explained at the same time: the focussing of the discussion  
 20 about Greek nationality on the Ionians and Athens. We may infer (and both Strabo's report and what we know about Hekataios otherwise corroborate the inference) that in the books of Hekataios neither the Ionian race nor Athens had that central position. He began with the Peloponnese and he did not treat Athens differently from (say) Thebes;  
 25 his arguments ἀπὸ τῶν μνημονευομένων and ἀπὸ τῶν ὀνομάτων merely prove that his thesis σχεδὸν δέ τι καὶ ἡ σύμπασα Ἑλλάς κατοικία βαρβάρων ὑπῆρξε τὸ παλαιόν is not to be qualified by any exception in favour of Athens. Accordingly the λόγος Ἑλλήνων, to which Herodt. 7, 94/5 refers, makes Ionians and Aeolians simply Pelasgians. All these considerations  
 30 leave no doubt that Herodotos' view about the nationality of the Greeks, developed in some detail at the first suitable place, and kept up throughout his work <sup>53</sup>), is not his own idea but the opinion of Ionian science generally and of Hekataios in particular, with whom he could assume his readers to be acquainted. The question then simply is: what are the  
 35 relations of this theory to the Attic legend, according to which the primeval Pelasgians were by no means the ancestors of the Athenians, but appeared at a comparatively late time as foreign immigrants, who settled in Attica only for a short period and only on Hymettos. And further: was this local legend necessarily felt to be in contradiction with

the general theory by which Athens was merely one of many originally Pelasgian towns? In answering these questions we must visualize (as far as possible) the conditions under which early historical science worked; we must take into account the readiness of the first learned travellers
   
 5 to accept the abundance of material offered to them, and we must consider also the essential difference between the two authors. For Hekataios the Attic legend was one of the numerous stories which Ionic *ιστορίη* gathered everywhere, an answer given by the local *λόγιοι* of his time to a question about the age and the origin of a monument which he took
   
 10 for what it was worth, as a piece of information historically satisfactory in so far as it did not openly contradict his general opinion about the ethnic character of the Greeks. Probably it did not even occur to him to ask who 'the Athenians' were for whom 'the Pelasgians' had built the wall of the city; all the better if the *λόγιοι* told him that the wall had been
   
 15 built in the time of Kekrops, who for him was a barbarian king. In any case, the story was for him a detail without particular importance<sup>54</sup>); neither the *Genealogiai* nor the two books of the *Periodos* would have had room for extensive discussions. For Herodotos on the other hand questions of this very kind on the basis of the *λεγόμενα* (verbal or written)
   
 20 are typical whenever a subject for whatever reason particularly roused his interest; and his interest was always alive when the subject had been treated by Hekataios before him, and also to a certain degree when Athens was concerned<sup>55</sup>). His talks with the Athenian *λόγιοι ἄνδρες* we have to imagine like those with the Egyptian priests, which he has
   
 25 reported in greater detail: he submits to them what Homer, 'the Hellenes', or Hekataios said; he compares the different views with each other, not always deciding between them, or he corrects the *λεγόμενα* on the basis of information which he believes to be authoritative, when they contradict his own 'pre-scientific' opinions or run counter to his likes and dislikes;
   
 30 he is always inclined to agree with the Egyptians, or (at least in his later period) to plead for a version honourable for Athens; and he particularly enjoys himself when he is able at the same time to correct Hekataios. Thus he submitted the story of the Pelasgians from Hymettos to 'the Athenians', that is to the *λόγιοι ἄνδρες* of his time, and not only gave
   
 35 their account fully but attached to it a suggestion very audacious for him. It is hardly credible that the contradiction between that story and the theory of the Pelasgian nationality should have escaped him: how could 'the Pelasgians' have built the city-wall for the Athenians if the Athenians were Pelasgians themselves? The assumption becomes im-

possible when already in 1, 57, in the detailed digression about the nationality of the Athenians, we find a reference to the wall-building Pelasgians—the Pelasgians living at Herodotos' own time in Plakie and Skylake on the Hellespont are descendants of those οἱ σύνοικοι ἐγένοντο Ἀθηναίοισι <sup>56</sup>)—  
 5 and again in 2, 51 where a clear distinction is made between Athenians and Pelasgians who Ἀθηναίοισι γὰρ ἤδη τηνικαῦτα ἐς Ἑλληνας τελέουσι σύνοικοι ἐγένοντο ἐν τῇ χώρῃ. In both passages the qualification occurs in a context which deals with the primeval Pelasgians, and it does not become intelligible until explained by 6, 137 <sup>57</sup>). It is surprising that in  
 10 6, 137 an analogous reference to the primeval Pelasgians is lacking, and it is as surprising that the Pelasgians from Hymettos and from Lemnos are not expressly called barbarians. But it is far more surprising, and quite unparalleled for Herodotos, to make additions like those in 1, 57 and 2, 51 which do not become intelligible until a later passage is reached,  
 15 without referring to this passage with an ἐν τοῖς ἔπιθε λόγοις or the like, or on the other hand when writing 6, 137 to avoid not only the explanation but any allusion to the fact that something is in need of an explanation. Herodotos nowhere criticizes the theory of Hekataios, on the contrary (in 1, 56 ff.) he stresses the fact that even the Athenians had  
 20 originally been Pelasgians and barbarians; but, on the other side, he nowhere indicates that there were two kinds of Pelasgians in Attica. It is modern commentators who read this statement into him, and it may be natural that they should, but it is hard to understand why Herodotos did not explicitly give that simple solution. Others do not  
 25 try to exculpate Herodotos but openly state that 'he met with the greatest difficulties concerning Athens', and that the passage in 2, 51 shows his 'complete helplessness' <sup>58</sup>). But this attack also misses the mark. The most unusual fact is this that Herodotos does not set forth a problem, or a discrepancy in the tradition which cannot have escaped him. Instead he  
 30 deliberately obscures the problem or, at least, avoids to mention it. I find no other explanation than the one resulting from the suggestion that in 6, 137-140 he combined two different elements, the Pelasgians of Hekataios (who had built the wall of the Akropolis in Athens) and the story which afterwards he heard in Athens about their flight to Lemnos and other  
 35 places. This explanation has the additional advantage of also making intelligible the tradition about the Tyrsenian-Pelasgians as recorded by later authors. We shall have to assume that Herodotos knew very well that his identification of the wall-building Pelasgians with the ravishers from Lemnos was arbitrary <sup>59</sup>); that—though he perceived that the

consequences of this identification led in a straight line to the rejection of the Ionian theory about the nationality of the Greeks (at least in regard to Athens)—he did not venture to draw these consequences, either for the whole theory (which he could neither refute by one detail nor replace 5 by a better one), or for Athens because he could find no explanation why Attica alone should not have been Pelasgian. Therefore he took the course unique for him of pointing by additions to a problem which he did not set forth after all.

Did another writer take up the problem? I am inclined to think that 10 nobody did, and thus we arrive at the second question proposed above p. 414, 5 ff.; 415, 34 ff. None of the Athenian local historians had any use for the Ionian theory, for no Athenian, not even Thukydides (cautiously though he words in 1, 2-3, avoiding the problem of race), doubted his people being Greek and autochthonous. Herodotos' authority in 6, 137 15 certainly was an educated man, but he ignored the primeval Pelasgians; he could do this because the legend, which we have ascertained to be older than Hekataios, did not know them. He only knew the wall-building Pelasgians, nor had he any reason to burden his answer with criticism of a learned theory (if he knew it at all) which did not yield anything 20 for the question of the Pelargikon. Herodotos ought to have put a supplementary question (as he occasionally did in Egypt) asking *εἰ μάταιον λόγον λέγουσι οἱ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἀποφαίνοντες Πελασγούς*, but he avoided this because the answer might have spoil the theory and his own beautifully built up narrative <sup>60</sup>). Our scanty knowledge of the 25 treatment of the Pelasgians by the earlier Atthidographers leads to the assumption that they ignored the primeval Pelasgians, too <sup>61</sup>). Of course, this is no foundation for prejudging Ph.s attitude. He was a scholar; he wrote more or less fully about the nationality of the wall-building Pelasgians; he had read Hekataios, and one expects him to have discussed 30 the theory that the Athenians originally were Pelasgians, as was maintained by some most distinguished authors. For discussing fundamental questions he had at his disposal his whole first book, which evidently was largely polemical <sup>62</sup>), and if he did discuss the theory it can only have been in order to reject it. In any case, in his second book, in which he 35 entered on narrative, he knows none but autochthonous Athenians, for whom Kekrops created the twelve towns as a protection against the Carians and the Boeotians, and Pelasgo-Tyrnsenians who came from outside and remained just long enough for building the wall and making an attempt on the town. For the nationality of the Athenians the latter were of

no more account than the (equally expelled) Temmikēs of Sunion.

(99) The required intermediate form Πελαργοί is furnished by οἱ τῆν Ἄτθιδα γράψαντες in Strabo 5, 2, 4 (= 329 F 1), who probably derives (though not directly) from Ph. <sup>1</sup>) both there and 9, 1, 18 εἰρηται δ' ὅτι 5 κἀνταῦθα φαίνεται τὸ τῶν Πελασγῶν ἔθνος ἐπιδημῆσαν, καὶ διότι ὑπὸ τῶν Ἄττικῶν Πελαργοί (Cas -σγοί ο) προσηγορεύθησαν διὰ τὴν πλάνην. It is an old popular etymology, and it was hardly Ph. who first introduced it into literature, whether or not Myrsilos (477 F 9) depends on him; one might expect it already in the *Atthis* of Hellanikos <sup>2</sup>). Whether Ph. described 10 the arrival of the Pelasgians in Attica (*visi sunt* either means φαίνονται ἀφικόμενοι or ab Atheniensibus cum primum in terra eorum apparuerunt), or whether he gave his general view about them, a short entry would have been sufficient in any case, perhaps in the context of F 94: τὸ δὲ τεῖχος (*scil.* of Kekropia) περιέβαλον καὶ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν ἠπέδιζον <sup>3</sup>) (see 15 323 F 16) Τυρσηνοί, οὓς Πελασγούς ἦντας Πελαργούς ἐκάλουν διότι κτλ. or something like that. The ethnical concept 'Pelasgians', whatever its relation with the Tyrsenians is <sup>4</sup>), is furnished in F 101; if they are Tyrsenian Pelasgians they naturally arrived by sea (*velis*), not (as Ephoros had it <sup>5</sup>)), from Boeotia. The scholiast takes the evidence for the equation 20 of Tyrsenians and Pelasgians from Latin authors (Varro and Hyginus) only, and being concerned with Italy, he naturally decides for their immigrating from Thessaly (*quod et propensius*). This means that the authors he mentioned followed Hellanikos, against whom the criticism of Dionysios of Halikarnassos (*A. R.* 1, 29 f.) is primarily directed. The misunderstan- 25 dings of the severely abbreviated Scholion must be ascribed to the scholiast, not to his learned source. This source certainly did not enumerate the possible countries of origin (in that case *Laconia* would be unintelligible, neither vestiges nor traditions of the Pelasgians existing there <sup>6</sup>), as unintelligible as the omission of Arcadia), or it did so merely 30 from the point of view of the Romans and dealing with the question where the Italian 'Pelasgians' had actually come from. Varro and Hyginus probably quoted Ph., who for all later authors was the real authority on the Attic Pelasgians, besides Hellanikos, because in these two authors they found the identification of the Tyrsenians with the 35 Pelasgians, in the former for the Attic Pelasgians, in the latter for those of Thessaly.

(100) We have no reason to doubt that the whole excerpt is taken from Ph. It renders the Athenian version of Herodotos' story of the Pelasgians on Hymettos as far as it happened in early times, and as far

as it concerned Athens in these times (6, 137, 3- 138, 1). It remains open whether the last words αἷς συνώικησαν point to its continuation, leading eventually to the conquest of Lemnos by Miltiades, or whether (and how) Ph. narrated the historical event in its proper place, viz. the third book.

5 The account, as far as it is preserved, is more accurate in particulars than that of Herodotos <sup>1)</sup>, partly by being supplemented from Hekataios <sup>2)</sup>: following the latter Ph. re-introduced the Tyrsenians in the place of the Herodotean Pelasgians, though not as a people different from the Pelasgians (which they were most probably in Hekataios <sup>3)</sup>), but as a more

10 accurate designation of one tribe belonging to the general ethnic concept of Pelasgians. We may compare the Sintians in F 101, who 'were Pelasgians and were called Sintians', or Thukydides' (4, 109, 4) Πελασγικόν, 'which as Tyrsenians had lived in Lemnos and Athens formerly', or Herodotos' (8, 44, 2) 'Athenians' who 'als long as the Pelasgians inhabited the present

15 Hellas, were Pelasgians, and were called Kranaoi'. Thus the constant character of a lawless people, tacitly attributed to his Pelasgians by Herodotos but unique otherwise <sup>4)</sup>, received a sufficient support, and this was desirable from the Athenian point of view: a character for savageness and piracy is assigned to the Tyrsenians in our earliest evi-

20 dence <sup>5)</sup>, and what is stated of the Italian Tyrsenians of the sixth to the fourth century B.C., in regard to whom our historical sources frequently emphasize these qualities <sup>6)</sup>, is dated back by the words ἐξ ἀρχῆς in a well known fashion because the conduct of the people in historical times seems to be the evidence of its distinctive character. An interesting

25 point is that this conclusion is supported by an etymology which is hardly earlier than Hippias, but which finds this character of the people in its very name <sup>7)</sup>.

(101) We cannot decide whether this is another entry in the chronicle or merely another quotation from the same succinct report <sup>1)</sup> to which

30 F 99-100 belong. The Lemnian Σίντιες of *Il. A* 594 (*Od. θ* 294) were Thracians according to Hellanikos 4 F 71 and got their nickname from the inhabitants of the neighbouring islands, ὅτι ἦσαν αὐτῶν δημιουργοί τινες πολεμιστήρια ἔπλα ἐργαζόμενοι. Whether or no the name is connected with the Thracian Σιντοί first mentioned by Thuk. 2, 98, 1<sup>2)</sup>, they

35 probably presented an old problem of the kind with which the Ionian ethnographers met wherever populations had undergone changes between the eighth and the sixth century B.C. The scholion, which (like that on *Od. θ* 594) is mainly concerned with explaining the name, presumably belongs to Porphyry, and he probably decided in favour of the opinion



of Hellanikos, whose name has dropped out here, but its learned character as well as the wording leave no doubt of its rendering Ph.'s view correctly. If that is so, it corroborates the equation Πελασγοί = Τυρσηνοί, which he got from Hellanikos <sup>3</sup>), for the latter. But he did not solve the problem of the nickname given to the Pelasgo-Tyrsonian Sinties in the same way: for although he derived it etymologically with Hellanikos from σίνεσθαι he did not explain it by their detrimental invention (and their connexion with the divine armourer Hephaistos) but ἐξ ἱστορίας by one definite act of σίνεσθαι. Consequently his Σίντιες Πελασγοί are the same as the Τυρρηνοί of F 100, and though living in Lemnos (like the Sinties of Hellanikos) they were called thus not by their neighbours in the Aegaeon but by the Athenians (like the Πελαργοί of F 99) <sup>4</sup>): Ph. then must have assumed that the poet, whom he did not regard as an Athenian <sup>5</sup>), spoke *ex sua aetate* <sup>6</sup>).

15 (102) This fragment belongs together with F 8/9 in the description of the Panathenaia, the festival according to Ph. evidently being established in the reign of king Erichthonios. From the article in the *Lexeis* Harpokration only, not the fragment of Ph., can be supplemented, for the prohibition of the participation of ξένοι is inferred from the speech of Deinarchos, which dealt with the case of Agasikles who 'Αλιμουσίους συνέδεκασε καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ξένος ὦν τῆι πολιτείαι ἐνεγράφη <sup>1</sup>). If the phyle was the winner in the first half of the fourth century B.C. <sup>2</sup>) the competition was not between individuals but between groups, as at the Theseia where in the second century B.C. ἐπίλεκτοι, ἔθνη, ἱππεῖς compete in εὐανδρία and εὐοπλία <sup>3</sup>), and it was not a 'beauty-competition' <sup>4</sup>) but a military display, which has no connexion with the θαλλοφορία of καλοὶ γέροντες <sup>5</sup>). Εὐανδρία does not mean κάλλος, but, as Xenophon expresses it <sup>6</sup>), σωματῶν μέγεθος καὶ ῥώμη, and consequently it is an affair of men. The εὐφωνία of the chorus is a corresponding term.

30 (103) Et. Gen. p. 160 Rei Σελεύκου· 'Ιάμβη· τινὲς ὅτι 'Ιάμβη 'Ηχοῦς καὶ Πανός θυγάτηρ \* \* τὴν Δήμητραν δὲ λυπουμένην παίζουσα καὶ ἀχρηστολογοῦσα καὶ σχήματα ἀχρηστα ποιοῦσα ἐποίησε γελάσαι. Schol. Nikand. *Alex.* 130 (= Schol. B Eurip. *Or.* 964) 'Ιάμβη δὲ τις δούλη τῆς Μετανεΐρας ἀθυμοῦσαν τὴν θεὸν ὁρῶσα γελοιώδεις λόγους καὶ σκώμματα τινα πρὸς τὸ  
35 γελάσαι τὴν θεὸν ἔλεγεν· ἦσαν δὲ τὰ ῥηθέντα ὑπ' αὐτῆς ἰαμβικῶι μέτρῳ ῥυθμισθέντα, ὅπερ αὕτη πρῶτον εἶπεν, ἐξ ἧς καὶ τὴν προσηγορίαν ἔλαβον ἰαμβοὶ λέγεσθαι. 'Ιάμβη δὲ θυγάτηρ 'Ηχοῦς καὶ Πανός, Θραῖσις δὲ τὸ γένος. The question of authenticity is the same here as in all other quotations of Conti: his source (or that of his authority) is the scholion

on Nikander, the abbreviated appendix or second part <sup>1)</sup> of which enumerated various pieces of information about Iambe, who previously simply had been called δούλη τις τῆς Μεταναίρας according to general tradition. One expects quotations, and Seleukos quotes τινές who certainly were cited by name originally. Thus the possibility exists that Conti used fuller Scholia, and that is not even excluded by the fact that Nikander does not say what Conti quotes him for, viz. that the iambos had been called after the Eleusinian Iambe. This *is* in the Scholia on Nikander, but (apparently) not in Seleukos where ἀχρηστολογεῖν leads <sup>10</sup> in another direction. We clearly distinguish two different points in the tradition: (a) the aition of the αἰσχρολογεῖν, which was customary also in the cult of Demeter at Eleusis, and (b) the derivation of the ἱαμβος. The custom, to which the Homeric hymn merely alludes <sup>2)</sup>, is derived from Iambe's conduct in *Bibl.* I, 30 πρὸς Κελεὸν ἐλθοῦσα (*scil.* ἡ Δημήτηρ) <sup>15</sup> τὸν βασιλεύοντα τότε Ἐλευσινίων, ἔνδον οὐσῶν γυναικῶν καὶ λεγουσῶν τούτων παρ' αὐτὰς καθέζεσθαι, γραῖά τις Ἰάμβη σκώψασα τὴν θεὸν ἐποίησε μειδιᾶσαι· διὰ τοῦτο ἐν τοῖς Θεσμοφορίοις τὰς γυναικῆς σκώπτειν λέγουσιν and in Diodor. 5, 4, 7 τῆς δὲ Δήμητρος τὸν καιρὸν τῆς θυσίας προέκριναν ἐν ᾧ τὴν ἀρχὴν ὁ σπόρος τοῦ σίτου λαμβάνει... ἔθος δ' ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς ἐν ταύταις ταῖς <sup>20</sup> ἡμέραις αἰσχρολογεῖν κατὰ τὰς πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὀμιλίας διὰ τὸ τὴν θεὸν ἐπὶ τῇ τῆς Κόρης ἀρπαγῇ λυπούμενην γελάσαι διὰ τὴν αἰσχρολογίαν <sup>3)</sup>). For the explanation of the iambos we have the two usual methods, one purely etymological <sup>4)</sup>, the other deriving the term from an eponym. The latter has come down to us in a number of variants, all of them equally without <sup>25</sup> value: some make Iambe a bacchant or look for her in Ionia, some introduce the slave woman of Keleos <sup>5)</sup>. Evidently the explanations of the Eleusinian αἰσχρολογεῖν and of the iambos have been fused together, the γελοῖα λέγειν and αἰσχρολογεῖν, which belongs to the iambos too, forming the link <sup>6)</sup>. Thus the Eleusinian Iambe has become a Thracian <sup>30</sup> woman: Nikander calls her Θρηῖσση Ἰάμβη, Philikos Ἀτθίς Ἰάμβη from the deme Halimus <sup>7)</sup>. One expects that Ph. followed the latter version, and if F 103 is taken from the *Atthis* we may assume that he described the cult of Demeter perhaps as circumstantially as the Panathenaia. But the quotation merely refers to the genealogy (the parallels adduced <sup>35</sup> p. 421, 30 ff. prove it to refer to the following words, not to *Metanirae ancilla*), and this is somewhat surprising; not because relations between Pan and Echo or even descendants from the couple were lacking <sup>8)</sup>, but because the transformation of the servant woman of the Hymn into a divine person is not quite in accordance with the rationalism of At-

thidography in these matters. One might suggest that Ph. mentioned a variant, but it may quite well be that a matter of cult is involved; and in that case the ἡχώ ('Hχώ?) on the Sacred Road \*) might furnish the explanation.

- 5 (104) Johann. Antioch. *F. H. Gr.* IV 538, 1 § 5. It is more likely that this fragment is taken from the *Atthis* than from *Περὶ μυστηρίων*. The greatest difficulty is that whereas we have not a single fragment about *Δήμητρος ἄφιξις* from the *Atthis* (F 103 is a scanty vestige, and the Scholia on Aristeides published by Lenz *Problem.* 8 p. 65 do not yield
- 10 anything beyond F 104b), we have from the second book of the *Atthis* the fully rationalized story of Theseus' attempt to abduct Proserpina (F 18). A minor difficulty consists in the fact that *fruges et fructus* and *rus colere* are mentioned in the discussion of the Kronia during the reign of Kekrops (F 97). We had better not waste our time over the latter:
- 15 it is an instance of the truly insoluble difficulties, to which any attempt at arranging the entire tradition in a chronological order necessarily was exposed. The Kronia are a fact of cult referred to primeval times by their very name, the Eleusinian cult is as closely connected with Kekrops' double Erechtheus by Athenian writers <sup>1)</sup>. It was impossible to reconcile
- 20 these two groups of events, and our knowledge is so limited that we cannot tell whether Ph. felt the difficulty and, if he did, how he solved it when he wrote what one may call the history of the cults of the state of Athens <sup>2)</sup>. But (like the Parian Marble) he did not accept into his account the seemingly natural connexion between Demeter and Dionysos,
- 25 although tradition was well acquainted with it <sup>3)</sup>: according to Ph. (F 5-7) Dionysos was in Attica three generations earlier. Concerning the principal difficulty it seems inconceivable to me that an *Atthis*, the patriotic character of which is so unmistakable, should have omitted what was possibly the greatest title of Athens to glory. The claim of
- 30 Athens to be the mother town of cultivation of grain was ardently discussed in literature even at a time when the question was no longer of any political importance for Athens; and in the records about the development of civilization we found vestiges of criticism directed against Hekataios of Abdera, who defended the claims of Egypt <sup>4)</sup>. Also F 18 does not oblige us to assume that Ph. eliminated or rationalized, in the principal points, the sacred story of Eleusis; it appears to be demonstrable that Ph.'s rationalism in this case, too, merely concerned itself with some individual features (as for instance the chariot drawn by snakes) which were contrary to nature but of secondary importance for the story

itself <sup>5</sup>). This implies that the 'genealogical' sources of Boccaccio deserve no confidence: F 104c—in the manner long since observed in regard to the *ιστορίαι* of the Homeric Scholia and to the excerpts of Parthenios and Antoninus Liberalis—assigns a whole story to one (or several) author(s), only a single feature of which (or variant) belongs to that (those) author(s) <sup>6</sup>). In this case, the feature which is proved to be Ph. by F 104 a b is the substitution for the miraculous chariot drawn by snakes of the ship with the corresponding figure-head (*ἔχει τι καὶ τοῦ σχήματος*). This is no unique invention: it is an exact parallel when, in the story of the Argonauts, *ξῖνοι φασὶν αὐτὸν* (*scil. Phrixos*) *ἐπὶ κριοπρώρου σκάφους πλεῦσαι* <sup>7</sup>). The rationalization may have been specially directed against the most famous literary representation in Sophokles' *Triptolemos* <sup>8</sup>); in the same manner the Cretan account was brought in against Tragedy in F 17. If we connect these suggestions with F 104 b, we may possibly infer that Ph. gave a succinct account of the geographical extent of the journey; this would incidentally have enabled him to criticize comparatively important counter-claims. Nothing is preserved, apart from F 103, of the first part of the Demeter story which happened in Eleusis and which the Parian Marble alone excerpted in detail <sup>9</sup>); actually, because of the many *aitia* contained in it, this first part would have been more important for a writer interested in matters of cult.

(105) In order to assign this fragment to its proper place we ought to know how much of it actually belongs to Ph. General opinion carries the whole scholion back to him as a matter of course. This is possible only if Erechtheus succeeded Kekrops immediately (or at a very short interval as he does in Herodt. 8, 44); but Ph. assigned Kekrops to the sixth generation before Erechtheus, and this would at the least make it impossible for him to enter the story as an event under the latter's reign: the Atthidographer cannot have tacitly passed over a chronological difficulty of this kind. But even if he did another difficulty arises which concerns the matter: under the stress of war a king sacrifices his own daughters, not those of his predecessor. If the scholion is one whole this would be a typical case in favour of the thesis that the problems of our tradition cannot be solved by considering literary sources alone. Most of the stories recorded by the Atthidographers reach back more or less far into the times previous to literature, the time of the formation of myths and legends which, at Athens, were not definitely established and crystallized by one authoritative poet <sup>1</sup>). The profound contradictions between the individual Atthidographers are due far less often to arbitrary

inventions of the writers, or to political and other tendencies, than to the 'learned' activity first of the λόγοι ἄνδρες, later of the tragic poets and the early prose writers, as for instance Pherekydes, and eventually of Hellanikos and the several Atthides after him. The work of the last-named writers consists in recording the tradition, trying at the same time to overcome and reconcile the contradictions that became obvious; it thus performs what genealogical epic poetry and prose genealogy had achieved for the epic, Panhellenic tradition. It is, therefore, seldom possible to form an opinion of Atthidographic tradition without entering into the factual questions. In regard to the daughters of Kekrops we cannot do that here with the fullness that would be necessary. I can merely lay down the thesis that the conception of their being 'dew-sisters' (*Tauschwwestern*) or 'merely certain qualities separated from Athena by mythological abstraction' <sup>2)</sup> prevents understanding from the very first. Our tradition even now distinctly shows a process in the reverse direction: originally independent figures are joined in a group of Παρθένοι, possibly at first of only two, for Herse was added later on, or at least comes from another sphere <sup>3)</sup>. We cannot distinguish the particulars of the development, but again and again in tradition we come across the competition between Kekrops and Erechtheus <sup>4)</sup>, which was never settled because it was impossible to do so. I see no difficulty in the assumption that the goddesses of the Aglaurion and the Pandroseion, who both belong to the Akropolis and to the earliest πόλις, and who, as goddesses, have no father, were made the daughters sometimes of Erechtheus, sometimes of Kekrops after they had been made human by being drawn into the sphere of Athena and particularly into the Erichthonios story. According to certain indications it is perhaps even more probable that they became parallel figures like their fathers <sup>5)</sup>, i.e. that Pandrosos became more closely attached to Erechtheus in the Erichthonios story and Aglauros to Kekrops in the story of the Areopagos. Again we cannot expect to be able accurately to trace or to measure the course of these myths and their intermediate stages. We do not know how old the oath of the epheboi in the Aglaurion is; what influence the oath (or the story of Ares and Alkippe, in which Poseidon also plays a part) exercised upon the development; whether the legend of the sacrificial death, related of Aglauros and 'the daughters' of Erechtheus, is connected with the part Ares plays (which does not seem probable at all), or else whence it derives. All these old stories are not determined as to their time more accurately than by the name of the king, which is quite sufficient for the ancient narrator;

but as the stories touch each other in various points all kinds of combinations become possible. Then difficulties began to arise as soon as authors tried to arrange the events in a continuous history of Athens. The sacrificial death especially (a frequent motif also in Athens or rather particularly in Athens) presented a double difficulty: no war at all was known during the reign of Kekrops (for the facts adduced in F 94 for the foundation of the Twelve Towns do not amount to a single war), and the daughter of Kekrops was too old to play a part in the only famous war in ancient times, the Eleusinian War in the reign of Erechtheus. The genealogists overcame such difficulties when they occurred with Panhellenic figures sometimes by doubling the figures, sometimes by extending their life over three (or even more) generations<sup>6</sup>). Atthidography (apart from the doubling of Kekrops and Pandion which serves another purpose) does not seem to have made use of these expedients, which were no longer quite in accord with the spirit of the fourth century B.C.; moreover, they would have been of little use in regard to the traditions about the daughters of the primeval kings. It was far more obvious to distribute the various stories among the (groups of) daughters, who by now had become a plurality: if this was done the daughters of Erechtheus alone came into the question for the war with Eleusis, and for the daughters of Kekrops there remained the Erichthonios legend, which did not furnish any difficulties as to the time<sup>7</sup>). This distribution doubtless determined the accepted tradition of later times<sup>8</sup>).

We now return to Ph., about whom an opinion could not be formed without this background, nor could it be more than an alternative opinion. We find that the accepted tradition is impossible for him if the whole Scholion belongs to him. If he knew an old legend about the sacrificial death of Aglauros, and if he thought that he must keep to this tradition for reasons we do not know and cannot guess<sup>9</sup>), one form only appears to be possible, the form in which the *Bibliotheca* arranges matters of this kind and which is frequent even in Great History, because it gives an easy transition to the successor: at the end of each reign Ph. gave (the number of the regnal years and) the descendants of each king, supplying short notices about the latter; e.g. that Aglauros was the first priestess of Athena (F 106) and sacrificed herself for her country; why Pandrosos received a sacrifice of sheep before each sacrifice of a cow to Athena (F 10), and other facts like that. By this expedient the question of chronology lost its primary importance, or at least the incompatibility was not so glaring as it would have been in a regular note entered more

than a century later than the reign of Kekrops. Even if a reader did feel doubts the λέγουσι, by which Ph. shifted the responsibility from himself, would appease him. I confess that this solution seems to me to be the simplest and at the same time the most likely; F 105 would thus belong to an earlier part of the *Atthis*, and it would follow F 99/101. The doubt tentatively expressed on p. 424, 30 ff. seems to lose foundation if we assume that the vague expression *ἐάν τις ἀνέλεγε ἑαυτὸν* (vague in comparison with the precision in the Erechtheus story *ἐάν μίαν τῶν θυγατέρων σφάξῃ*<sup>10</sup>) was used deliberately. It was perhaps an exaggerated caution which caused me to claim definitely for Ph. only the enumeration of the daughters by spacing out the first sentence, but the sequence *ὡς φησιν ὁ Φιλόχορος· λέγουσι δὲ ὅτι* actually does not permit of full certainty; the condition of the Scholion on Demosthenes being what it is, there always remains the possibility that Didymos emptied out his stock of notes about Aglauros when commenting on Demosthenes' mention of the oath of the epheboi *ἐν τῷ τῆς Ἀγλαύρου*. But if the Scholion must be distributed between two authors we cannot ascertain at all what Ph. related about the three daughters of Kekrops. Of course the Erichthonios story would be probable, but with a view to F 10 (and F 12?) a note referring to cult may be quite as likely, and might be found in *Lex. Rhet.* p. 239, 7, where a quotation of Ph. from the Theseus story (F 183) follows: *δειπνοφόρος· ἑορτῆς ὄνομα· δειπνοφορία γάρ ἐστι τὸ φέρειν δεῖπνα ταῖς Κέκροπος θυγατράσιν Ἐρση; καὶ Πανδρόσῳ καὶ Ἀγραύλῳ· ἐφέρετο δὲ πολυτελεῶς κατὰ τινα μυστικὸν λόγον, καὶ τοῦτο ἐποίουν οἱ πολλοί(?)· φιλοτιμίας γάρ εἶχετο*. In that case it would even become uncertain whether F 105 must be assigned to the *Atthis* at all; perhaps *Περὶ θυσιῶν, Περὶ ἑορτῶν*, even *Περὶ τῶν Ἀθήνησι μυστηρίων* could be suggested.

(106) Hesych. s.v. Ἀγλαυρος· θυγάτηρ Κέκροπος· παρὰ δὲ Ἀττικοῖς καὶ ὀνόμασι κατ' αὐτῆς· ἦν δὲ ἰέρεια τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς. *Synag. Lex.* p. 329, 24 Bkr  
 30 Ἀγλαυρος· ἡ θυγάτηρ Κέκροπος· ἐστὶ δὲ ἐπώνυμον Ἀθηνᾶς. Phot. s.v. Καλλυντήρια καὶ Πλυντήρια (supplemented from *Lex. Rhet.* p. 270, 1 Bkr.)· ἑορτῶν ὀνόματα . . . Θαρρηλιῶνος μηνός . . . τὰ μὲν Πλυντήριά φησι<sup>1</sup>) διὰ <τὸ μετὰ> τὸν θάνατον τῆς Ἀγραύλου ἐντὸς (ἐνός *Lex*) ἑνιαυτοῦ μὴ πλυθῆναι <τὰς ἱεράς> ἐσθῆτας, εἰθ' οὕτω πλυθείσας τὴν ὀνομασίαν λαβεῖν ταύτην· τὰ  
 35 δὲ Καλλυντήρια ὅτι πρώτη δοκεῖ ἢ Ἀγραυλος γενομένη ἰέρεια τοὺς θεοὺς κοσμησαί. If this fragment is taken from the same context as F 105 we should have the same abundance of possible sources to which *Περὶ ἡμερῶν* might be added.

(107) Schol. Aristoph. *Lys.* 58 διήμηρτο γὰρ εἰς ὄ μέριδας τὸ παλαιὸν ἢ

Ἄττικῆ· Πανδίων γὰρ διαδεξάμενος τὴν Κέκροπος βασιλείαν, προσκτησάμενος δὲ καὶ τὴν Μεγαρίδα, ἐνειμε τὴν χώραν τοῖς παισὶν εἰς ὄμοιρας· Αἰγεῖ μὲν τὴν παρὰ τὸ ἄστυ μέχρι Πυθίου, Πάλλαντι δὲ τὴν Παραλλίαν, Λύκωι δὲ τὴν Διακρίαν, Νίσωι δὲ τὴν Μεγαρίδα <sup>1)</sup>. The quotation occurs in the self-contained section 9, 1, 5-7 about the Megaris, which Strabo took from the *Νεῶν Κατάλογος* of Apollodoros <sup>2)</sup>. He unfortunately cut it down severely in the point most important for us, a fact never sufficiently taken into account. This greatly impairs the understanding of the passage. Strabo lays down the thesis ἡ Μεγαρίς τῆς Ἄττικῆς μέρος ἦν, or, as he puts it at the opening, τὸ παλαιὸν μὲν οὖν Ἴωνες εἶχον τὴν χώραν ταύτην οἱ περὶ καὶ τὴν Ἄττικὴν, οὕτω τῶν Μεγάρων ἐκτισμένων. This thesis he proves in § 5-6 (1) from Homer, who does not mention Megara or Megaris separately, but was believed to have treated them as part of Ἀθῆναι, δῆμος Ἐρεχθίδος <sup>3)</sup>; (2) from the stele on the Isthmos, which formerly marked the boundary between Ionia and the Peloponnese <sup>4)</sup>; (3) from the evidence of the Atthidographers and other earlier authors <sup>5)</sup>. § 7 records 'historically' how conditions changed in the times after the Trojan War: return of the Heraclids; attack of the Dorians on the Athens of Kodros and their defeat in open war; but the Dorians occupied the Megaris, founded the city of Megara, and made the population Dorian, ἠφάνισαν δὲ καὶ τὴν στήλην τὴν ὀρίζουσαν τοὺς τε Ἴωνας καὶ τοὺς Πελοποννησίους. It means a heavy loss for our knowledge of Attic topography that Strabo found it superfluous to copy in full the (evidently detailed) discussion of Apollodoros about the demarcation of the four parts of the country as recorded by the various authors: τὴν δ' εἰς τέτταρα μέρη διανομὴν ἄλλων ἄλλως εἰρηκότων is all we get apart from a quotation from Sophokles <sup>6)</sup>, which may be the earliest evidence, but, of course, is topographically vague. Only for the share of Nisos which alone interests Strabo here <sup>7)</sup> he quotes Ph. and Andron, and even these not fully. A difference as to the matter between the two authors does not seem to exist: the foreigner Andron states a general frontier which is also generally intelligible, *viz.* that 'the rule of Nisos extended to Eleusis and the Thriasian plain'; the Atthidographer makes a more specialized statement which was intelligible to any Athenian. I am not sure that Ph. indicated the line of demarcation merely by τὸ Πύθιον without any qualification <sup>8)</sup>, for even in F 75, where the reader can have no doubt at all, he says (correctly and fully) τὸ ἐν Οἰνότηι Πύθιον. The qualification, which perhaps could not be given as briefly, has fallen a victim to abbreviation both here and in the scholion on Aristophanes. But however this may be, there is no doubt that this



unknown Pythion to which the rule of Nisos extends in Strabo and that of Aigeus in the Scholion, must be looked for on the boundary between Attica and Megaris<sup>9</sup>). This was evident to an ancient reader of an *Atthis* progressing in chronological order, even if Ph. had not told him: the 5 Eleusinian War, which led to the reunion of the two old πόλεις, had been fought in the third generation before Pandion under Erechtheus. There is no need to stress the fact that Ph., who aimed at proving the former dependence of Megara on Athens, would have done the Athenian cause an ill turn if, on this occasion, he had conceded to Megara the former 10 possession of Eleusis, *i.e.* the utmost claim of the adversaries<sup>10</sup>) which was always violently rejected by Athens. Of course, the text does not state this: μέχρι is a neutral term, and it was a preconceived opinion which made Wilamowitz<sup>11</sup>) state that 'Ph. makes the realm of Nisos extend over the Thriasian plain to the Aigaleos'. It is hard to understand 15 that this opinion has been almost universally accepted<sup>12</sup>). What follows from the statement about the demarcation of Nisos' realm is that Ph. narrated the whole story of Pandion's division of the inheritance<sup>13</sup>), and we should have expected anyhow that he did so because it was one of the chief proofs of the dependence of Megara on Athens, and at the same 20 time (later at least) the radical answer to the claims to any part of Athenian territory raised by Megara. Ph. certainly did not fail to stress this implication duly. The Scholion on *Lysistrate* shows that he gave the four sons the names which they had in the tradition throughout<sup>14</sup>), and that he called two of the really Attic 25 parts of the country Paralia and Diakria, describing the third by ἡ παρά (περὶ) τὸ ἄστυ μέχρι τοῦ Πυθίου; thus two only agree with the 'party' names of the sixties of the sixth century<sup>15</sup>).

We cannot ascertain the details of Ph.'s account. There may have been variants on many points two of which are of some importance: what 30 was his conception of the acquisition of Megara, and what position did he assign to Aigeus among the brothers? As to the first: that Megara was actually an acquisition cannot be plainly inferred from the account of Strabo<sup>16</sup>), and Apollodoros, whose attitude towards pseudo-history was more independent, may not have believed that it was. That it was 35 in the opinion of Ph. we infer not so much (if at all) from the fact that Nisaia does not appear among the Twelve Towns of Kekrops in F 94 (where in fact we do not even expect it), but because this opinion predominates in our tradition. Only the question how remains doubtful: προσηκισάμενος Schol. *Lys.* 58 is vague, but becomes clearer by Plu-

tarch's statement that Theseus προσκτησάμενος δὲ τῆι Ἀττικῆι τὴν Μεγαρικὴν βεβαίως, τὴν θρυλουμένην ἐν Ἴσθμῶι στήλην ἔστησεν<sup>17</sup>). For it seems certain that Theseus conducted war not against Megara but about Megara; also according to Strabo (where the event is not dated) the stele 5 is put up on the basis of an agreement which ὀρίων ἀμφισβητοῦντες πολ- λάκις οἱ τε Πελοποννήσιοι καὶ Ἴωνες concluded. That Ph. mentioned the stele may unhesitatingly be inferred from Androtion 324 F 61, who unfortunately does not give a date either. This is not of great importance, for it does appear fairly probable that Ph. also made Pandion receive 10 the Megaris from his father-in-law, the Megarian king Pylas<sup>18</sup>), and this allows of a deduction as to Ph.'s version of the previous history of Pandion and in consequence as to his account of the Athenian kings from Erechtheus to Pandion. As regards the position of Aigeus, tradition since Sophokles assigns to him a kind of supreme royalty (the same 15 which we have to assume for Kekrops of F 94), and Ph. probably agreed with this tradition<sup>19</sup>). That position was natural as he resided in the πόλις and ruled the plain belonging to the city (together with that of Eleusis); moreover the list of the *Atthis* requires one king. This form of the tradition implies the narrating of the re-union, which was partly 20 performed by Theseus although still in Aigeus' reign<sup>20</sup>). The conception as a whole is different from that of the Twelve Towns, but the two did not necessarily come into open conflict with each other<sup>21</sup>). Also it is self-evident (but had better be expressly stated) that the division of Attica into four districts by Pandion stands in no connexion whatever with the 25 distribution of its inhabitants into four (personal) phylai by Ion<sup>22</sup>).

There remains one question only not to be answered with certainty, which, however, does not concern Ph. in particular because he certainly did not create the conception of the division into four states and of the Megaris belonging to Attica; it is the question of the absolute age of that 30 tradition. It seems to have been generally known in the fourth century; the evidence of Sophokles dates it in the fifth century<sup>23</sup>), and the krater mentioned n. 14 carries us back to its first quarter. The turning-point of the sixth to the fifth century, if seen from the point of view of Attic history, is not a credible time for the birth of the claim which the story 35 shows; we rather expect a period of acute antagonism between Athens and Megara, in which political propaganda of the sort usual at that time supported and exaggerated such claims. Developments of this kind cannot be fixed to a definite year, but the assertion seems to me wrong in principle that 'before Peisistratos had captured Nisaia, and the Lacedaemo-

nian court of arbitration, in exchange for it, had finally assigned Salamis to the Athenians, it would be inconceivable to express the claim to Megarian soil in this manner' 24). That capture, which actually was not held, seems to me, on the contrary, to be the *terminus ante* of the more extensive claim that the entire Megaris was originally part of Attica, a claim on the one hand comparable (for the territory of the Megaris does not include Salamis) to the assertion that Athens and Salamis were originally connected, which was based on a forgery in the text of Homer 25), and on the other to the claim the Megarians laid to the Eleusinian district, which had not long been connected with Athens. That the latter claim was forgotten at the time of Theagenes is as incredible as the assumption of the fight about Salamis having begun with its capture by Peisistratos. The literary feud between Ἀθηίδες and Μεγαρικά, which in the fourth and third centuries was of historical interest only 26), had a predecessor, not in literature but in life, in the second half of the seventh century and the first half of the sixth, when on both sides the λόγοι ἄνδρες produced and piled up the arguments for the conflicting claims of their rival towns. Surely the grammarian Apollodoros was far from being the first to point out that Homer did not know anything of Megara and Megarians, while praising Athens and making Aias' ships join those of the Athenians; and at a time when Solon claimed for Athens the role of the πρεσβυτάτη γαῖα Ἰαονίης the Athenians certainly recognized themselves in Homer's Ἰάονες, who would have included the pre-Dorian inhabitants of the Megaris. This sort of argument is almost typical for early times 27). Also a division of Attica into ἡ παρὰ τὴν πόλιν χώρα (which included the Eleusinian plain), Παραλία, and Διακρία gives the impression of being earlier than Kleisthenes' division into ἄστν, παραλία, μεσόγεια, in which Eleusis belonged to the παραλία 28). Further, though the 'parties' of the παράλιοι, πεδιακοί, and διάκριοι are mentioned only once in the sixties of the sixth century, nobody will doubt that this antagonism had developed and asserted itself for two or three generations. These three parts of Attica never were either political or even mythological units, perhaps differing in this from the four phylai of 'Ion'. Atthidography, following earlier speculations, had dated the trichotomy of the country back to Pandion, and to Atthidography fell the task of eliminating it. How this was done we learn, at least partly, from F 108.

(108) Plutarch. *Thes.* 13 οἱ δὲ Παλλαντίδαι πρότερον μὲν ἤλιπον αὐτοὺς τὴν βασιλείαν καθέξειν Αἰγέως ἀτέκνου τελευτήσαντος· ἐπεὶ δὲ Θησεὺς ἀπεδείχθη διάδοχος, χαλεπῶς φέροντες εἰ βασιλεύει μὲν Αἰγέως θετοῦς γενόμενος Πανδίωνι καὶ μὴδὲν Ἐρεχθίδαις προσήκων, βασιλεύσει δ' ὁ Θησεὺς πάλιν ἐπὶ τῶν ὧν καὶ

- ξένος, εἰς πόλεμον καθίσταντο. (2) καὶ διελόντες ἑαυτοὺς οἱ μὲν ἐμφανῶς Σφηττόθεν ἐχώρου ἐπὶ τὸ ἄστυ μετὰ τοῦ πατρός, οἱ δὲ Γαργηττοὶ κρύφαντες ἑαυτοὺς ἐνήδρευον, ὡς διχόθεν ἐπιθησόμενοι τοῖς ὑπεναντίοις· ἦν δὲ κήρυξ μετ' αὐτῶν ἀνὴρ Ἄγνουσιος ὄνομα Λεῶς. (3) οὗτος ἐξήγγειλε τῷ Ἰησεί τὰ
- 5 βεβουλευμένα τοῖς Παλλαντίδαις· ὁ δὲ ἐξαίφνης ἐπιπεσὼν τοῖς ἐνεδρεύουσι πάντας διέφθειρεν, οἱ δὲ μετὰ τοῦ Πάλλαντος πυθόμενοι διεσπάρησαν. (4) ἐκ τούτου φασὶ τῷ Παλληγέῳ δῆμῳ πρὸς τὸν Ἄγνουσίῳ ἐπιγαμίαν μὴ εἶναι, μηδὲ κηρύττεσθαι τοῦ πυχῶριον παρ' αὐτοῖς· ἀκούετε λεῶν· μισοῦσι γὰρ τοῦνομα διὰ τὴν προδοσίαν τοῦ ἀνδρός. The connexion with F 107 is evident.
- 10 F 108 still belongs to the reign of Aigeus: μετὰ τῶν ἡλικιωτῶν shows Theseus as the leader of the young men (ἐφηβοί), and the detailed narrative of Plutarch corroborates this, for he gives as the reason of the war with Pallas the recognition and the acknowledgement of Theseus by Aigeus<sup>1</sup>). Although the arrangement of the *Life* of Theseus does not
- 15 allow of many certain inferences for Ph. <sup>2</sup>) it does show that in his *Atthis* the latter part of Aigeus' reign mainly consisted of exploits of Theseus. They can naturally be divided into (1) his exploits before his arrival in Athens; (2) those of the crown-prince which are undertaken from Athens and the scene of which is laid in Attica proper down to the
- 20 expedition to Crete which brings about Aigeus' death<sup>3</sup>); (3) the exploits of the king. The first two groups are simple and can easily be brought into connexion with Aigeus, even if we do not know whether Ph. related the first retrospectively (τῷ δὲ δεῖνα ἔτει Ἰησεὺς ἀφίκετο εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας ἀπὸ Τροϊζήνος, ἀποκτείνας ἐν ὁδῷ or however he put it);
- 25 we realize that we cannot actually picture the composition of the *Atthis*. The third group is far more problematical. In Plutarch it opens with the synoikism, and here the description of the details is remarkable for the anachronistic bringing in of political points of view. This tendency increases in the course of the narrative<sup>4</sup>), and the adventures of that period
- 30 are brought, as far as possible<sup>5</sup>), into a close and causative relation to the political life of Theseus. We do not find tendencies of this kind (at least not to the same degree) in the records about either the preceding or the following kings (of course, with the exception of Theseus' successor Menestheus): only the so-called 'hero of democracy' is used for mythical
- 35 reflections of modern political antagonisms. As this use reaches back at the least to Euripides, and as there are also in the *Life* two diametrically opposite conceptions of Theseus crossing each other it is difficult to tell what was Ph.s attitude towards him. Could we ascertain it we should find it of some importance also for the question of Plutarch's authority

for ch. 13 with the fuller report about the war of Pallas, which Schwartz denotes as 'Ph.', Wilamowitz as 'hardly Ph.', neither giving any reason <sup>6</sup>). The connexion between Plutarch and F 108 is, in fact, very close, and the surplus of the former can easily be accounted for if we consider that  
 5 the Scholiast merely excerpted from a continuous narrative those parts which referred to the *μίασμα αΐματος Παλλαντίδων* mentioned by Euripides *Hipp.* 34/7, i.e. the section corresponding with § 2-3 of Plutarch's account; he disregarded the reason for the campaign (Plut. § 1) and the particulars concerning Leos (§ 4); he breaks off with *αὐτούς ἀναιρεῖ*, even  
 10 omitting the last sentence of § 3 about the dissolving of the main army which, in his view, does not belong to his subject. Even the fact that Ph. is first cited in ch. 14 (F 109) does not tell decisively against deriving ch. 13 from him. But there does exist a factual discrepancy which, strangely enough, has never been observed although in view of the topographical  
 15 questions it ought not to be passed over lightly: according to Ph. the sons of Pallas are to occupy the town *ἐξ ἐφόδου προσπεσόντες* while Pallas himself engages the army of the Athenians which has set out to meet him; according to Plutarch they are to attack them in common with their father (*διχόθεν ἐπιθησόμενοι τοῖς ὑπεναντίοις*), i.e. to fall upon  
 20 them from behind or from the flank. Since the story of Pallas must be expected in every *Althis* <sup>7</sup>), and since there exist variants both about the date of the war <sup>8</sup>) and about the figure of Leos <sup>9</sup>), one will not be greatly surprised to find a variant in the particulars of the action itself as well <sup>10</sup>). The consequence is that one cannot not print ch. 13 in the text as a  
 25 parallel version of F 108: the two preserved reports are closely related to each other, but not identical.

Pallas, whom Sophokles F 872 characterizes as being *σκληρὸς καὶ γίγαντας ἐκτρέφων* <sup>11</sup>), receives according to the poet *τῆς γῆς τὰ πρὸς νότον* in relation to the city, according to Ph. the Paralia (on F 107). It is in keeping  
 30 with this apportionment that his army marches on the Sphettian road (Ph.) or (according to Plutarch's authority) starting from Sphettos. We need not ask whether Ph. regarded Sphettos, one of the old Twelve Towns (F 94), as the seat of Pallas' government; it is of no importance for the account of the war, which gives three fixed points: Athens,  
 35 Sphettos, Gargettos. The position of Sphettos has not yet been definitely established; in any case it is situated in the Mesogeia, considerably more to the south than Gargettos <sup>12</sup>), and for the report it does not matter much whether it must be looked for at the Hag. Christos, north-west of Koropi, or near Markopulo. If Pallas sets out from that point and his  
 Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.)

sons lie in ambush near Gargettos (in the depression between Hymettos and Pentelikon) we obtain an intelligible picture of both reports: in that of Ph. the Athenians would march on the road leading to Marathon turning south somewhere near the sanctuary of Pallenis<sup>13</sup>) in order to offer battle to the troops of Pallas which approach 'openly' on the Sphettian road (*i.e.* from the south) at the place where the armies meet. As soon as they had turned south the Pallantids, starting from Gargettos, could undertake without disturbance their *coup de main* on the city. In the report of Plutarch the ambush near Gargettos proves that Pallas intended to attack the citizens in the depression between Hymettos and Pentelikon at the north frontier of his realm somewhere near the Pallenis sanctuary where the Sphettian road may have crossed that leading to Marathon; the battle was to be decided by the surprise-attack of the sons on the rear or the flank of the citizens. Each of these two different tactical plans is clear in itself<sup>14</sup>).

The reason of the war is lacking in F 108, which simply opens with the words Πάλλαντος ἐπιθέσθαι τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις διανοουμένου, but (without answering for all details) we may supply it from Plutarch. Some modern writers found a contradiction<sup>15</sup>) because they overlooked the fact that the designation of Aigeus as θετός γενόμενος Πανδίωνι is not the opinion of the narrator (the presumed Ph.) but abuse on the part of Pallas, which is (or need be) as little in accord with the truth as the designation of Theseus as ἐπηλυς καὶ ξένος. At the best this is an exaggeration of νόθος from the point of view of the franchise law of 451/0 B.C.<sup>16</sup>), but more probably the words are meant to raise suspicions as to whether the ἐπηλυς καὶ ξένος acknowledged by Aigeus really was his son<sup>17</sup>). As for the other Attidographers so for Ph. it was necessary to unite the country again after its division by Pandion<sup>18</sup>), and since he recorded the annihilation of the Pallantids as an exploit of Theseus' youth<sup>19</sup>) he could make the same use of the claim to succession as the authority of Plutarch.

(109) Kallimach. Dieg. 10, 18 (= F 230 Pf.) Ἐκάλῃς · » Ἀκταίη τις ἔβαιεν Ἐρεχθεὸς ἐν ποτε γουνώϊα. Θησεὺς φυγῶν τὴν ἐκ Μηδείης ἐπιβουλήν διὰ πάσης ἦν φυλακῆς τῷ πατρὶ Αἰγεῖ, ἅτ' αἰφνίδιον ἀνακομισθὲν ἐκ Τροϊζῆνος μειράκιον αὐτῷ οὐ προσδοκῆσαντι βουλόμενος δ' ἐπὶ τὸν λυμαινόμενον τὰ 35 περὶ Μαρθῶνα ταῦρον ἐξελεθεῖν ὅπως χειρώσαιο καὶ εἰργόμενος, κρύφα τῆς οἰκίας ἐξελεθὼν περὶ ἑσπέραν ἀπῆρεν. αἰφνίδιον δὲ ὑετοῦ βαγέντος κατ' ἐσχατιὰν οἰκίδιον θεασάμενος Ἐκάλῃς τινὸς πρεσβυτίδος, ἐνταῦθα ἐξενοδοκῆθη, πρὸς δὲ τὴν ἔω ἀναστὰς ἐξήμει ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν. χειρωσάμενος δὲ τὸν ταῦρον ἐπαγγίμει ὡς τὴν Ἐκάλῃν · αἰφνίδιον δὲ ταύτην εὐρῶν τεθνηκυῖαν,

ἐπιστε[νάξ]ας ὡς ἐψευσμένος τῆς προσδοκίας, δ' ἐφ[ . . . ]εν (ἐφήμισεν  
 Norsa-Vitelli ἐφρόνησεν? Pf.) μετὰ θάνατον (post τοῦτο transpos. Castig-  
 lioni) εἰς ἀμοιβὴν τῆς ξενίας ταύτηι παρασχέσθαι, τοῦτο ἐπέτελεσεν δ[ῆ]-  
 5 μων<sup>1)</sup> συστησάμενος δν ἀπ' αὐτῆς ὠνόμασεν, καὶ τέμενος ἰδρύσατο 'Ἐκα-  
 λείου Διός. Et. gen. s.v. 'Ἐκάλη·<sup>2)</sup> ἡ ἡρώϊς, εἰς ἣν καὶ ποίημα ἔγραψεν Καλ-  
 λιμάχος· παρὰ τὸ εἰσκαλεῖν ἢ εἰς καλιὴν πρὸς ἑαυτὴν προτρέπειν· φιλόξενος  
 γάρ, ὡς καὶ Καλήσιος (Il. Z 18). 'Ἐκάλη οὖν ἡ πρὸς ἑαυτὴν πάντας καλοῦσα.  
 Steph. Byz. s.v. 'Ἐκάλη· δῆμος τῆς Λεοντίδος φυλῆς· ὁ δημότης \* \* 'Ἐκαλῆ-  
 10 θεν . . . καὶ 'Ἐκάλ<ε>ιος Ζεὺς<sup>3)</sup>. Hesych s.v. 'Ἐκάλειος Ζεὺς· δν 'Ἐκάλη  
 ἰδρύσατο. We still find ourselves in the reign of Aigeus. In Plutarch  
 the capture of the Marathonian bull immediately follows the Pallas War  
 which he related perhaps following Kleidemos, certainly not following  
 Ph.<sup>4)</sup> The latter is first cited in the *Life* not yet for the adventure itself,  
 which belongs to the substance of the *Vita* used by Plutarch<sup>5)</sup> and is fully  
 15 told in the few words of § 1, but only in §§ 2-3 for the honour conferred  
 on Hekale by Theseus in the cult of Zeus Hekaleios. Obviously Plutarch,  
 when he added §§ 2-3, had in mind the famous poem of Kallimachos;  
 for singularly enough he proves the truth of the adventure by the report  
 about Hekale which agrees with that of Kallimachos<sup>6)</sup>. The poet fre-  
 20 quently mentions his human authorities with or without their names;  
 in the latter case the source is usually supplied by his commentators<sup>7)</sup>.  
 Whether he did it in this case, and if so which alternative is true, can-  
 not be said; in any case, judging from the design of ch. 14, there seems to  
 be no doubt that Plutarch took the name of Ph. either from the poem  
 25 or (perhaps more likely) from a commentary on it. A learned commentator  
 need not have cited the *Atthis*; he may as well have consulted the special  
 work Περὶ τῆς τετραπόλεως, in which Ph. had collected the antiquities  
 of the region, being the first to do so<sup>8)</sup>. As to Kallimachos himself, the  
 assertion that he 'certainly draws from an earlier Atthidographer'<sup>9)</sup> is  
 30 a pre-conceived opinion, but we cannot decide whether he used the latest  
 history of Athens<sup>10)</sup> or the special book which probably gave fuller  
 particulars; as to the time, there does not exist the least difficulty, even  
 if the poet drew his material from the *Atthis* and if the *Hekale* belongs to  
 his early period<sup>11)</sup>. In any case, it is fairly certain that he drew on Ph. who  
 35 seems to have been the first to introduce the story: there are no mentions  
 of it in the remains of the other *Atthides*, and although (considering  
 the state of our tradition) conclusions *e silentio* are doubtful, matters  
 look different if Ph. narrated the story in his book about the Tetra-  
 polis; for as far as we can see we must not expect too great an

amount of tradition about the demes in the earlier Attidographers <sup>12</sup>).

The two reports preserved, that of Ph. in Plutarch and the paraphrase of the Callimachean poem in the *Diegeseis* do not contradict, but supplement each other. The paraphrase, otherwise poor, is even more accurate than Plutarch, but there are no variants, and the poet evidently had at his disposal not more than a brief note about the cult of the place, hardly as much as the nine lines in the Teubner edition of Plutarch. This partly explains his collecting material which has extremely little to do with Hekale wherever he could find it. It is evident (a) that the starting-point and the centre of the narrative is a little-known village cult of Zeus in Attica which Theseus is said to have introduced <sup>13</sup>), and that this Zeus was called 'Εκάλειος also by Kallimachos <sup>14</sup>); (b) that the authority of the poet derived this name from Hekale who had made vows to Zeus for the successful return of Theseus, vows which she could not fulfil herself, so that Theseus fulfilled them for her on a larger scale <sup>15</sup>); (c) that the honour conferred on Hekale, which Theseus ordered at the same time, and which was to keep up the memory of her φιλοξενία, consisted in the institution of an annual banquet at which she was invoked as Hekaline <sup>16</sup>). We cannot interpret with any degree of certainty these facts of cult to which we may add the statement of Plutarch that the inhabitants of the village called the hostess of Theseus Hekaline <sup>17</sup>); but one should not call the story which Kallimachos found in his authority a 'simple village tale' <sup>18</sup>), nor even a 'local Attic tale' <sup>19</sup>). The story has all the features of an aition, and the parallel story of Herakles and Molorchos <sup>20</sup>) rouses suspicions as to its primitiveness and its character as a 'popular legend'. It certainly is not very early: if the Theseus of the Tetrapolis chased the bull, he did not spend the night in the village; he could reasonably do that only if he came from Athens. Even apart from Hekale, the capture of the Marathonian bull is hardly 'the earliest tale and the starting-point of the whole mythos' <sup>21</sup>); it is more likely to be one of the tales taken over from the Herakles story, and it is not sheer arbitrariness but a feeling of the truth that the Marathonian bull is often said to be just the Cretan one. Most of the Theseus stories are not earlier than the sixth century. When the legend of Theseus had been quickly developed and quickly become famous, the local λόγιοι of the fifth century may have connected their Hekale with the hero, thus securing for their village a place in the history of Athens <sup>22</sup>). It must have been these λόγιοι who promoted their local god to the honour of being Zeus; the humanisation of Hekale was the necessary consequence, although she may have remained



a 'heroine' for them. It is not surprising to find in modern literature the schematic conception that by this connexion 'the festival of the district was to be subordinated to the centre of the State as a matter of religious policy' <sup>23</sup>), but I do not feel able to take this suggestion seriously.

5 It seems to me almost grotesque to draw a parallel between the Hekalesia as invented for this purpose and the cults of great gods belonging to important places taken over by the city—Eleusinia, Brauronia, Dionysia *etc.* Tradition rather recommends the suggestion that Ph., when investigating the Tetrapolis, was the first to pay attention to the village festival, and that he took up the story told him by the local *λόγιοι*. Later on He-  
 10 kale had the good fortune that the innocent tale pleased Kallimachos: it is through him that it became famous.

(110) The expedition to the Pontos together with Herakles, too, probably occurred in Ph. during the time when Theseus was crown-prince. It has  
 15 no fixed place because it is not an old legend, but invented in order to supply a reason for the attack of the Amazons on Athens <sup>1</sup>). The abduction of women is so frequent a motif (after the literary prototype of the *Iliad*), and it offers itself so conveniently that we could leave it at that, if the expedition for the girdle of the Amazon did not occur in the dodek-  
 20 athlos. Since it does we shall have to assume that this exploit of Herakles was the starting-point for the motivation, and there can hardly be a doubt that the inventor was the author of the, or a, *Theseis*. For him it was obvious to borrow from the *Herakleis*, and he hit two birds with one stone, for by the reason he supplied he gained at the same time another  
 25 great exploit for his hero, whose legend was not abundant in adventures extending beyond the narrow boundaries of Attica. It goes without saying that he did not spoil that game by making Theseus a mere companion or follower of Herakles <sup>2</sup>). This connexion is formed under our very eyes, and where it appears first it has reasons of its own: in Athens  
 30 the great art of the fifth century paints and carves the battle of the Amazons among the glories of Athens; Pheidias represents it on the shield of Athena Parthenos. When the same artist represented the *λόχος* ὁ σὺν Ἡρακλεῖ μαχόμενος πρὸς Ἀμαζόνας on the pedestal of the Olympian Zeus, *τέτακται δὲ καὶ Θησεύς ἐν τοῖς συμμάχοις τῶι Ἡρακλεῖ* <sup>3</sup>), he did so  
 35 because this was the only way of introducing the national hero at Olympia at all. But Euripides, who could easily have emphasized the companionship in arms in his *Herakles*, in the chorus v. 411 contents himself with *τίν' οὐκ ἄφ' Ἑλλανίας ἄγορον ἀλίσας φίλων*; and it is not by accident that the passage in the *Herakleidae* <sup>4</sup>) is vague and ambiguous, it ob-

viously avoids mentioning the name of Herakles. What must now be called the late dating of the adventure is (as far as we can see) the unanimous tradition of the fifth century: to the three important authors adduced by Plutarch—Pherekydes (whose Attic tendencies are certain),  
 5 Hellanikos (probably in the *Atthis*), and Herodoros (although he wrote a *Καθ' Ἡρακλέα λόγος*)—we must add Pindar, who mentions Theseus and Peirithoos <sup>6</sup>), and the vases with Theseus, Peirithoos, Phorbas, and Antiope <sup>6</sup>). It is an adventure in which Theseus is accompanied by his own small *λόχος*, he is not a member of another's following, even if that  
 10 consists of the most famous heroes. Herodoros, who wrote about 400 B.C., knew very well why he stated that *πολλῶν τότε τοῖς ἀρίστοις ἔθλων γενομένων οὐδενὸς τὸν Θησέα μετασχεῖν ἀλλὰ μόνους Λαπίθαις τῆς Κενταυρομαχίας* <sup>7</sup>). It is regrettable that we have no express evidence as to the attitude of the Atthidographers <sup>8</sup>) but dim indications only pointing to the sug-  
 15 gession that they followed Hellanikos. That Theseus engaged in the enterprise by himself—a matter of course in the *Theseis*—was bound to appear more glorious to their patriotic tendencies; the authority of genealogical literature told in their favour, while on the other hand authorities to the contrary did not exist <sup>9</sup>). It is not a decisive argument  
 20 that Plutarch quotes Ph. only for the early dating; but considering the immense later literature about Theseus, the *τινὲς ἄλλοι* need not necessarily be Atthidographers. The difference existing between Kleidemos and Ph. about the name of the Amazon (see below) seems to be significant and may point to more essential divergencies. I see no reason against  
 25 assuming that the early dating was an innovation of Ph., which became the accepted tradition after him and through him <sup>10</sup>). His patriotic tendency was not weaker than that of Kleidemos and Phanodemos, but it was restrained by more careful judgement, and he does not seem to have shared the endeavour to set up Theseus as an Attic rival figure  
 30 in the place of the 'Dorian' Herakles. In regard to the relation between the two heroes, he may have been guided by the fact that Herakles was a god, and that his cult surpassed by far that of Theseus even in Attica. He did not depreciate Theseus when he made the young warrior emulate him, but he may have declared that the cults which his Theseus ceded to  
 35 Herakles (F 18) were the first cults offered to the new god, thus providing for Athens a new title to glory and one better founded. On the whole this was a happy solution; at least it is difficult to imagine how e.g. Kleidemos managed to explain without some violence the facts of cult. Moreover (whether Ph. related the expedition to the Pontos among

Theseus' exploits as a crown-prince, or merely belatedly as the πρόφασις for the attack of the Amazons on Athens), it was an indisputable advantage of the early dating that it allowed of describing as an organic whole the history of Theseus' regal period in the following sections: (1) organization of the state: in home policy the synoikism and the democratic<sup>11</sup>) constitution, in foreign policy the securing of the frontiers<sup>12</sup>); (2) the attack of the Amazons, in which the new state stood the test, showing its strength also in the help given to Adrastos in the war against Thebes (F 112); (3) the abduction of Helena and the expedition to Thesprotia together with Peirithoos, which originally may have been the end of Theseus' life<sup>13</sup>), but which now introduces the last chapter (4), the political opposition in Athens and Theseus' exile. Theseus' greatest achievement in home politics and its deplorable issue because of the ingratitude of the democracy which he had created are ingeniously kept apart by the 'adventures' of the king. How far Ph. really composed thus, and whether he aimed at an artistic effect in his narrative, remains of course an open question. But a scheme of that kind is the basis of Plutarch's narrative although it is somewhat obscured by his endeavour for completeness, by the variants, and by his attempt at uniting different conceptions of the hero. [Ἀντιόπη] We cannot state with certainty whether the earlier authors enumerated here also gave 'the Amazon' the name of Antiope. Who made Theseus undertake the expedition by himself was free to choose the name (unimportant as it is in itself), i.e. he was not obliged to take into account the Herakles story in which the name of Hippolyte for the queen and the owner of the girdle had become to a certain degree established<sup>14</sup>). It is difficult to decide this point because of a remarkable divergency in the tradition: apart from Pindar F 175 Bgk, there does not exist before Ph. any certain literary evidence of Antiope having been carried off by Theseus<sup>15</sup>); on the contrary, as early an author as Simonides<sup>16</sup>) calls her Hippolyte, and Kleidemos 323 F 18 as well as Istros 334 F 10 give her the same name, the latter in his catalogue of the wives of Theseus. Isokrates *Panath.* 193 and Justin. 2, 4, 23<sup>17</sup>) are sufficient proof that Hippolyte was the accepted name in the fourth century, whereas in the time after Ph. Antiope became as prevalent<sup>18</sup>) as his connexion of the adventure with the expedition of Herakles. But the refigured vases give the name of Antiope for the Amazon captured by Theseus, whereas the representations of the battle of Herakles show Hippolyte<sup>19</sup>). How this can be explained remains an open question<sup>20</sup>), but neither the Attic 'Amazon stele'<sup>21</sup>), nor Pausanias' Ἀθηναῖοι, nor indeed his Μεγαρεῖς<sup>22</sup>),

give any help. Ph., of course, had to choose the name Antiope because he made Theseus the companion of Herakles. Again this involved no depreciation of Theseus: 'the queen' Antiope<sup>23</sup>) really was a γέρας.

(111) These aitia from the narrative of Theseus' expedition to Crete can easily be placed in the account of Ph. as it has been restored in the commentary on F 14/16. The fragment (unlike F 183) may accordingly be assigned to the *Atthis*. Judging from Plutarch's manner of citing authorities when there exist variants or special traditions, we shall not doubt that the whole of what is printed as F 111 belongs to Ph., *i.e.* that he also reported the institution of the Kybernesia, no matter whether Plutarch wrote φησίν or φασίν. Naturally the Kybernesia<sup>1</sup>) is meant for the κυβερνήτης, or rather for the κυβερνήται, if (as is the case here) the ship ἐκ τῆς πρύμνης καὶ ἐκ τῆς πλώρας πηδαλίοις ἤσκητο, καὶ κυβερνήτας ναύτας τε διπλοῦς εἶχε<sup>2</sup>). It appears certain that the hero, or heroes, of navigation worshipped in Phaleron were anonymous originally, *i.e.* before they were brought into the Theseus story<sup>3</sup>): Pausan. I, I, 4—ἐνταῦθα καὶ Σκιράδος Ἀθηναῖς ναός ἐστι καὶ Διὸς ἀπωτέρω, βωμοὶ δὲ θεῶν τε ὀνομαζομένων Ἀγνωστών καὶ ἡρώων καὶ παιδῶν τῶν <μετὰ> Θησέως<sup>4</sup>) καὶ Φαληροῦ—may have abbreviated but he attests anonymity in cult and introduction of a name in literature for another altar: ἐστὶ δὲ καὶ Ἀνδρόγεω βωμὸς τοῦ Μίνω, καλεῖται δὲ Ἥρωος· Ἀνδρόγεω δὲ ὄντα ἴσασιν οἷς ἐστὶν ἐπιμελὲς τὰ ἐγγύρια σαφέστερον ἄλλων ἐπίστασθαι. This Ἥρωος has been identified with the κατὰ πρύμναν ἥρωος whom the learned source of Clement attests for Phaleron<sup>5</sup>); he might unhesitatingly be taken for the 'helmsman Nausithoos' of Ph., but Kallimachos in the fourth book of the *Aitia* (F 103 Pf.), who certainly used an Atthidographer, also calls him Androgeos. It is not clear what was the basis of this identification and whether it was connected with the Theseus story, but the two helmsmen, who in Ph. come from Salamis, make it impossible for Androgeos to have acted this or a similar part<sup>6</sup>). Ph. gives their names as Nausithoos and Phaiax, and we had probably best keep to the accepted opinion that the obvious invention utilized the *Odyssey*. We merely must state the facts more accurately and thus explain them: Phaiax is simply 'the Phaeacian'<sup>7</sup>), but the more important κατὰ πρύμναν κυβερνήτης is not just somebody of the people (if he were Ph. might simply have taken the names of Πρυμνεύς and Πρωρεύς from *Od.* θ 112/3), but it is the king who conducted the people to Scheria and founded the town. His parents, according to *Od.* η 56 ff., are Poseidon and Periboia, and these two names, relatively very old in the Theseus story<sup>8</sup>), may have been the starting-point for

distributing *Ναυσίθοος Φαίαξ* between the two anonymous heroes who had been brought into the story of Theseus' expedition to Crete <sup>9</sup>). It is not expressly said that Ph. also regarded the *Σκίρου ἱερὸν* <sup>10</sup>), near which the two 'heroa' were situated, as a foundation of Theseus, but it is very likely that he did. Skiros was mentioned earlier, and the heroa were to bear witness that it was he who put the two helmsmen at the disposal of Theseus: if he established a cult for them he could not very well omit Skiros. The historical situation assumed in this account of the Cretan adventure is perfectly clear <sup>11</sup>).

<sup>10</sup> F III shares with F 107 the tendency to dispute, or silently eliminate, Megarian claims, which is effected in this instance by shifting Skiros to Salamis. But there is this typical difference that in F 107 the Athenians wishfully claimed Megara (always hostile as it was and, although completely overshadowed, never mastered) as a part of ancient Attica, whereas <sup>15</sup> they unhesitatingly acknowledged the former independence of Salamis as an old friend and ally of Athens, thus agreeing with the interpolator of the Catalogue <sup>12</sup>). But again we state a difference which does honour to the historical judgement of Ph.: the interpolator makes Aias unite his twelve ships with the fourfold number of the Attic contingent, <sup>20</sup> Ph. regards Salamis as the earlier naval power: Athens at Theseus' time may have had a few boats for fishing and for coastal navigation; she may even have been able to build somewhat larger ships <sup>13</sup>); but for navigation on the open sea she is obliged to borrow her technical staff from Salamis. The importance of the persons invented for this purpose <sup>25</sup> becomes even more evident by the fact that the helmsman carries a name already in earlier poetry, which certainly did not point to Salamis, possibly not even to Athens <sup>14</sup>). On the other hand Menesthes (who actually differs from Menestheus as little as Pherekles does from Phereklos) as a hostage certainly is an Athenian, not a 'youth from Salamis' <sup>15</sup>). If he is <sup>30</sup> 'the son of a daughter' of Skiros, his father (Peteos?) must have married a daughter of Skiros, which in itself might be a challenge to the Megarian tradition handed down in Plutarch *Thes.* 10, 3 according to which Skiros was the son-in-law of Kynchreus. The chronological difficulty is unimportant, if it exists at all, for Skiros may be older than Aigeus; the <sup>35</sup> factual difficulty seems to be greater: if Menestheus is one of the hostages, his family cannot have been expelled from Athens by Aigeus <sup>16</sup>). But the authority of Plutarch *Thes.* 32, 1 did not draw this consequence either when he described the political antagonism between the descendant of Erechtheus and the king-to-be Theseus. It is more likely that Ph., when

dealing with the expedition to Crete, did not think of this antagonism than that he reported a return of Menestheus, or even distinguished him from Menesthes. The expedition to Crete is, in any case, originally a tale quite different from the story of the exile of Theseus, which seems to be 5 considerably later than the former <sup>17</sup>).

(112-113) It is not quite certain that the two fragments belong together and are taken from the *Athis* because we cannot really form an idea of how fully Ph. narrated the war of the Seven against Thebes in the confined limits of one book. But he could describe this event only 10 by subordinating it under one of the exploits of king Theseus, *i.e.* in the form of a digression. F 113 indicates a short narrative restricted to the intervention of Athens, if we are right in referring it to the Attic Harma; the quotation proper of Ph. in F 112 would agree. Doubts might arise not so much because F 112 contains a *εὐρημα* and Ph. wrote a book 15 *Περὶ εὐρημάτων*, but because of the sentence about the rival claim of Herakles which seems to indicate such a book <sup>1</sup>). But this sentence, in which *ἐν τοῖς Περὶ Ἡρακλέους* refers to Plutarch's biography of Herakles <sup>2</sup>), decidedly gives the impression of being a marginal note by a reader: if it was an afterthought of Plutarch <sup>3</sup>) we should expect *οἱ δὲ* or (if he 20 regarded *σπονδαί* and *ἀποδοῦναι* as different actions, which is not very likely, for the killed were yielded up according to a fixed formula, *ὑπόσπονδοι*) *τὸ δ' ἀποδοῦναι . . . ὡς ἐν τοῖς Π. 'Η. γέγραπται*. Strabo's excerpt from Apollodoros' *Catalogue of Ships* <sup>4</sup>), which depends on the mention of the Boeotian village Harma (*Il. B 499*), presents more 25 serious difficulties: he first brought the Attic Harma into the discussion with his formula *ἐτέρα οὔσα κτλ.*, and after copying a detailed description of the observation of lightning by the Pythaiatai he returns to the Boeotian Harma and gives very succinctly the two *aitia* of its name, *viz.* from the chariot of Amphiaraos or from that of Adrastos. There follows the 30 citation of Ph. which in this text refers to the Boeotian village <sup>5</sup>). But I do not find this reference credible because it would imply a description of the Theban War with all the particulars, with variants about the fates of the various heroes, and with a discussion of the (numerous) local claims of Boeotian places. On the contrary, it seems credible that 35 Ph., when entering among the historical events of Theseus' time Adrastos' appeal for help in Athens, mentioned the stages on his way so far as they offered opportunities for recording Attic local legends, thus securing this Athenian claim to glory which needed securing because it was not founded in epic poetry nor old at all <sup>6</sup>). The Attic legend that the curiously formed

mountain-top in Parnes <sup>7)</sup> took its name from the chariot of Adrastus serves the same purpose as the tombs at Eleutherai and Eleusis; the *κομῆται* are the inhabitants of Phyle in the district of which the peak called Harma is situated <sup>8)</sup>. Whereas according to the accepted version <sup>5</sup> Adrastus, after having lost his chariot near the Boeotian Harma, continued his flight on horseback <sup>9)</sup> and was saved by the magic horse Areion, according to the Attic legend (officially acknowledged by Argos at some time) it is the villagers of the Attic Parnes who help him and who may have escorted him into the city to their king Theseus <sup>10)</sup>.

<sup>10</sup> If this conjecture is correct it is possible to go a little further in the restoration of Ph.s report: it is probable, to say the least, that the detailed account of the observation of lightning by the Pythaiatai was taken from the same passage of the *Atthis*. It certainly comes from an Attic source, its lucidity is not unworthy of Ph., and wherever Attic specialties occur <sup>15</sup> in Strabo's ninth book one is inclined to think first of Ph <sup>11)</sup>. We can easily imagine that, and how, Ph. brought the custom <sup>12)</sup> into a causative connection with the story of Adrastus. Further there can be no doubt that he mentioned the burial in Attic soil of the heroes killed before Thebes: the internal logic of his report requires this, for it is because of this very <sup>20</sup> burial that the *Atthis* related the story of Adrastus. Moreover, the existence of the tombs is the chief proof for the claims of Athens, which even Boeotian authors were obliged to acknowledge later on <sup>13)</sup>; this certainly was not earlier than the fourth century, but the acknowledgement does remain surprising and shows the immense influence of Tragedy. Surely <sup>25</sup> Ph.s narrative also contained the distinction between the πολλοί and the ἡγεμόνες, not so much because Plutarch does not give a variant for it (he simply follows the general tradition which he had modified in § 4 by the variant from the *πλεῖστοι* and the addition of a specialty taken from Ph. <sup>14)</sup>), but because it occurs already in Eurip. *Hik.* 754 ff.: ὦν δ' οὐνεχ' <sup>30</sup> ἀγών ἦν, νέκρους κομίζετε; — ὅσοι γε κλεινοῖς ἔπτ' ἐφέστασαν δόμοις. — πῶς φῆτις; ὁ δ' ἄλλος ποῦ κεκμηγότων ὄχλος; — τάφωι δέδονται πρὸς Κιθαιρῶνος πτυχαῖς. — τοῦκεῖθεν ἢ τούθενδε; τίς δ' ἔθαψε νιν; — Ἰθυσεύς, σκιδώδης ἐνθ' Ἐλευθερίσ πέτρα <sup>15)</sup>. This seems to resemble the manner of Hellanikos, who at that time modernized the heroic battles of Troy, but in fact it <sup>35</sup> is probably different <sup>16)</sup>: Eleutherai, situated on the road from Eleusis to Boeotia, at the top of the pass over Kithairon, formerly had been Boeotian, and if the town claimed the tombs of the fallen in the Theban War she meant those of the heroes which alone were mentioned in epic poetry. Such a claim is on a level with that of the Boeotian Harma to Amphiarao

or Adrastos; here internal Boeotian antagonisms become apparent which are certainly earlier than the occupation of the place by Athens<sup>17</sup>). That Eleutherai entered voluntarily into the state of Athens (as Pausan. 1, 38, 8 declares) may be doubted because of its position in regard to 5 constitutional law<sup>18</sup>); it looks like Athenian invention which also tried to justify the acquisition by dating it back to the period of the kings<sup>19</sup>). This was not done in regard to Plataiai, but there are certain parallels in the inventions concerning Salamis. Nothing favours the assumption that the capture took place at the same time as the alliance with Plataiai 10 in 519/8 B.C.<sup>20</sup>); on the contrary, the occupation and fortification of Eleutherai was a preliminary condition; before the alliance could be effected Eleutherai had to be firmly in the hands of Athens. The time of Peisistratos would be the latest possibility, but it is not very credible historically<sup>21</sup>); perhaps we must go back to the seventh century. The 15 fact that the god of Eleutherai was given a precinct on the slope of the Akropolis<sup>22</sup>) also tells in favour of that time; it was the symbol of his belonging to the city: compare the sanctuaries of the Eleusinian Demeter and the Braurionian Artemis. It is conceivable, but not very probable, that Eleusis claimed the tombs at that time; the Eleusinian claim seems 20 to be independent from the Kithaironian—a true duplicate.

In Eleusis were shown on the road from Eleusis to Megara, not far from the Ἄνθιον φρέαρ, the sanctuary of Metaneira and the τάφοι τῶν ἐπὶ Θήβας<sup>23</sup>). We cannot tell *a priori* when any old tombs, which existed in abundance everywhere, were said to be these τάφοι, and those who 25 find here the memory of a time when Eleusis belonged to Megara and Megara to Boeotia cannot perhaps be strictly refuted. We have to admit that we do not know the λόγος which the Eleusinians attached to this legend, how they explained that the Seven were buried in their district and that their bodies were not left on the battlefield to dogs and birds 30 of prey (as in the epos<sup>24</sup>)), or (as others affirmed) their ashes brought back to their native country. To speculate would be to no purpose<sup>25</sup>). That the place of burial was on the route, or a possible route, of the army is not an explanation, at least not a factually satisfactory one, even though the Eleusinian λόγοι ἄνδρες may have found it sufficient. But it 35 can be stated with certainty that it was not Aischylos who introduced the attribution of the tombs; this and the explanation had come down both to him and to the author of the *Theseis*, provided that poem already recorded the action of Theseus. For this epos concentrated on the city of Athens, and we should expect it to have assigned the tombs as well as



the *heroon* of Adrastos <sup>26</sup>) to Athens, unless the Eleusinian claim had to be taken into account. We do not know with certainty the date either of the *Eleusinioi* <sup>27</sup>) or of the *Theseis*; but concerning the latter probability points to the last decade of the sixth century, and at that time the Eleusinian tombs may have had their name for a long time. In any case, a uniform Attic tradition, which could easily admit the claims of Eleutherai and Eleusis <sup>28</sup>), was opposed by Pindaros who in 468 B.C. said emphatically: ἐπτά δ' ἔπειτα πυρᾶν νεκρῶν τελεσθέντων Ταλαιονίδας / εἶπεν ἐν Θήβαισι τοιοῦτόν τι ἔπος 'ποθέω στατιᾶς ὄφθαλμὸν ἑμᾶς / ἀμφοτέρων μάντιν τ' ἀγαθὸν καὶ δουρὶ μάρασθαι' <sup>29</sup>). It seems to me to be obvious that these lines were meant to contradict at once a claim of Athens, which was not supported by any authority, epic or other, and made by Aischylos before an almost Panhellenic audience and in a form which actually put Thebes in a bad light <sup>30</sup>). The objection of Pindar remained without effect, the Athenian representation of the events, even in the more accentuated form of Euripides' *Hiketides*, carried the day <sup>31</sup>). It is very typical that about a century later even Theban local authors do not share Pindar's standpoint (which actually was untenable in view of the epos), they were obliged to acknowledge the Attic claim, merely venturing to defend the version of Aischylos, which was more favourable for Thebes: Κρέων γὰρ . . . οὐ παρήκε τοῖς προσήκουσιν ἀνελομένοις θάψαι· Ἰκετεύσαντος δὲ Ἀδράστου Θησέα καὶ μάχης Ἀθηναίων γενομένης πρὸς Βοιωτοῦς, Θησεὺς ὡς ἐκράτησε τῇ μάχῃ κομίσας ἐς τὴν Ἐλευσινίαν τοὺς νεκροὺς ἐνταῦθα ἔθαψε· Θηβαῖοι δὲ τὴν ἀναίρεσιν τῶν νεκρῶν λέγουσιν ἐβελονταὶ δοῦναι καὶ συνάψαι μάχην οὐ φασι <sup>32</sup>).

The representation of the Attic story also deserves a short notice because it is instructive in several ways as a point of method. Plutarch labels the two versions with the names of Aischylos and Euripides. That the latter in his *Hiketides*, performed in 421 or 420 B.C., drew upon the *Eleusinioi* of Aischylos is as evident as the fact that his representation meant an immensely increased severity in the verdict on the Theban attitude. The whole tragedy is one accusation against that hostile town: Thebes had unleashed war in spring of 431 B.C., and Thebes was regarded responsible for the merciless (though perhaps not wholly unmerited) treatment of Plataiai in summer of 427 B.C. After the battle of Delion in Oct. 424 B.C., the Boeotians had refused to deliver up the bodies of the fallen Athenians, and this offence against the acknowledged usage of war, captiously motivated as it was, seemed to Thukydides (4, 97/9) to deserve a detailed report. What would be more natural than the assumption that

Euripides altered the version of Aischylos under the immediate impression of the events of 424 B.C.? We regularly draw inferences like that about innovations in mythos made by the tragic poets, and it is necessary that we do. But we receive a hard shock as to the soundness of our method, and are deeply disquieted, when in this case we perceive the assumption to be demonstrably wrong, and when we learn that Euripides did not innovate but that he only selected one of two possible versions, the selection being naturally determined by the scandal of the battle of Delion too<sup>33</sup>). In the λόγων ὄθισμός Τεγεγέτων τε καὶ Ἀθηναίων, which Herodotos<sup>34</sup>) records as preceding the battle of Plataiai and in which he makes both parties bring forward καινὰ καὶ παλαιὰ ἔργα, the Athenians prove their better right to the place of honour in the line of battle among other arguments by the story of the Hiketides: τοῦτο δὲ Ἀργείους τοὺς μετὰ Πολυνεΐκος ἐπὶ Θήβας ἐλάσαντας, τελευτήσαντας τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ ἀτά-  
 15 φους κειμένους, στρατευσάμενοι ἐπὶ τοὺς Καδμείους ἀνελέσθαι τε τοὺς νεκροὺς φάμεν καὶ θάψαι τῆς ἡμετέρης ἐν Ἐλευσίῃ. We do not know whether the alteration, which is thus proved to be pre-Euripidean, had been made in a tragedy or in a funeral speech<sup>35</sup>), but the mere fact is sufficient for forbidding the simple inference which concerns Euripides only. Instead  
 20 we are presented with a number of difficult questions extending far beyond the limits of this commentary. Still we shall have to touch upon them, because once again an apparently easy and typical invention opens unthought-of perspectives or (as one says to-day) becomes important in regard to the 'history of mind'. The notice about the πρῶται σπονδαὶ  
 25 περὶ ἀναιρέσεως νεκρῶν assigned by Plutarch to Ph. can no longer be treated by rule of thumb as the patriotic invention of the latter who before his *Atthis* had written a book Περὶ εὐρημάτων. The εὐρημα may well have occurred in a sophistic paper or in any other fifth century book dealing with cultural development and Greek νόμοι. About the Hellenic usage  
 30 of war<sup>36</sup>) we find another illuminating passage in a speech which Herodotos put in the mouth of Mardonios<sup>37</sup>). When and where was a sort of code developed? Who (that is quite another question) carried back its various ordinances to εὐρεταὶ of the heroic period, or illustrated them by examples from that time?<sup>38</sup>). Were those ordinances universally  
 35 knowledged at least by the 'civilized' Greek states? What differences as to time and as to place can be perceived? Where and when in particular did the idea have its origin which guaranteed the respect for the dead body even of an enemy?<sup>39</sup>) Wilamowitz contends that 'the Boeotians never accommodated themselves unreservedly to the general Hellenic

usage of war; even after the battle of Leuktra they delivered up the killed under particular conditions only' <sup>40</sup>). I am not sure that the only certain case, that of the year 424 B.C. <sup>41</sup>), allows of such a sweeping statement: the very detailedness of the narrative in Thukydides seems to show that this was not a usual Boeotian attitude, but that the case was felt to be quite singular. It may be explained (if not by the particular conditions of this campaign) by the atmosphere of hatred which certainly was not less intense in Thebes than it was in Athens. Are we, in these circumstances, to invent earlier cases, which furnished a funeral orator with a reason for giving an edge to the Aeschylean story? Our tradition is far from complete and rarely goes into details, but as to the time (and perhaps as to the matter as well) Tanagra in 457 B.C. and Koroneia in 446 B.C. offer themselves. But neither can be considered for Aischylos; and the war of 506 B.C. with the splendid Athenian victory on the Euripos has no room (at least not as far as we know) for a situation in which Thebes could have refused to hand over the bodies of the fallen <sup>42</sup>). Did Aischylos after all merely intend to illustrate a custom generally acknowledged in Greek warfare (to put it quite roughly)? If a special cause for putting a slur on Thebes was lacking, was his invention merely an expression of the indignation against the wicked neighbour, the 'Boeotian pigs' <sup>43</sup>), kindled by the assault of 506 B.C., when at a critical moment they had tried to stab the young democracy in the back? Or was the poet influenced by the recent behaviour of Thebes in the Xerxes War? We cannot answer these questions because we know almost nothing about the *Eleusinioi* save the plot. But not one of the suggestions, which are conceivable theoretically, seems to accord with what we know of Aischylos. Even if we attribute to him as possible, and (after 480 B.C.) probable, a dislike of Thebes, the true explanation is perhaps more simple. The problem is the invention of the plot for which a topical motive cannot be found. If Tragedy is to be defined generally as 'a piece of dramatized heroic myth' <sup>44</sup>), we obviously have in the *Eleusinioi* a specimen of creation of an Athenian myth. This would not be a unique case: the Attic tragic poets generally were certainly actuated by the conscious desire to acquire for their town a share in the Panhellenic mythos and its first great wars of coalition because their city had come off badly in epic poetry. I think that we are even able to show with some amount of certainty the elements of Aischylos' creation. The Eleusinian poet had given to him as his point of departure the tombs in Eleusis and their explanation (those of Eleutherai he did not know or he passed them over, and in his play there hardly was room for

the tradition of Harma, if the play belongs to his earlier period). Thence everything develops quite naturally out of the question: who buried in Eleusis those who had fallen before Thebes? The persons of two actors were thus provided, real persons, figures of the mythos, not Athens and Thebes, but Theseus and Adrastos, who in the *Thebais* was the only survivor, and whose role may be compared with that of Danaos in the *Hiketides*. It is uncertain (but unlikely) whether a representative of Thebes was introduced besides them; the design may even have been more simple than that of the *Hiketides*, which was the first play of a trilogy. The request of Adrastos with a long speech about the fate of the fallen, a messenger's report about the obtaining of the bodies, the funeral procession (one thinks of the *Persians* in both 'acts' <sup>45</sup>), as the conclusion of the *Hepta* is problematic) seems all that was needed <sup>46</sup>. All the more light is thus focussed on Theseus, who just before had attracted the attention of Hellas by his victorious defence against the Amazons <sup>47</sup>). Now for the first time foreigners apply to him for assistance, as in other contexts they had applied to Herakles, and (unsafe though the foundation may be) one might regard the notice that Ἡρακλῆς πρῶτος ἔδωκε νεκρούς τοῖς πολέμοις as the second motif for the invention. We do not know its origin, nor can we find a place for it in the history of Herakles, but in our tradition the claim competes with that of Theseus. That may imply that in this case, too, a transfer of a motif from the *Herakleis* to the *Theseis* has taken place. The σπονδαὶ περὶ νεκρῶν ἀναίρέσεως would be on a level with the tale of the Marathonian bull (on F 109), attaching a local tradition of uncertain but not very high antiquity to the person of Theseus who (almost more for the sake of Athens than for his own) increasingly becomes ἄλλος Ἡρακλῆς <sup>48</sup>). In this story nothing whatever points to the time of Peisistratos. At the utmost the question might be raised whether Aischylos created a Theseus who gave help beyond the frontiers of Athens, or whether the *Theseis* from the late sixth century B.C. already related the supplication of Adrastos, *i.e.* whether (again to put it roughly) the epic poet introduced Theseus and Aischylos Eleusis.

(114) Hesych. s. v. σεισάχεια· Σόλων χρεῶν ἀποκοπήν δημοσίων καὶ ἰδιωτικῶν ἐνομοθέτησεν, ἥνπερ σεισάθειαν ἐκάλεσε, παρὰ τὸ ἀποσεῖσαι τὰ βάρη τῶν δανείων. Apostol. *Προν.* 15, 39 σεισάθειά σοι μηδέποτε γένοιτο· τοῦτ' ἔλεγον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι πρὸς τοὺς ὑφείλοντας καὶ οὕτω τὸ δάνειον ἀποδόντας· λέγεται δὲ σεισάχεια χρεωκοπία κτλ. (= Phot. Sud.) <sup>1</sup>).—Aristot. Ἀθπ. 6, 1 κύριος δὲ γενόμενος τῶν πραγμάτων Σόλων τὸν τε δῆμον ἠλευθέρωσε καὶ ἐν τῷ παρόντι καὶ εἰς τὸ μέλλον κωλύσας δανείζειν ἐπὶ τοῖς

σώμασιν, [καὶ νόμους ἔθηκε] <sup>2</sup>) καὶ χρεῶν ἀποκοπὰς ἐποίησε καὶ τῶν ἰδίων καὶ τῶν δημοσίων, ἃς σεισάχθ<ε>ια<ν> καλοῦσιν <sup>3</sup>) ὡς ἀποσεισάμενοι τὸ βάρος <sup>4</sup>). Plutarch *Solon* 15, 2 ἀ δ' οὖν οἱ νεώτεροι τοὺς Ἀθηναίους λέγουσι τὰς τῶν πραγμάτων δυσχερείας ὀνόμασι χρηστοῖς καὶ φιλανθρώποις ἐπικαλύπτοντας  
 5 ἀστείως ὑποκορίζεσθαι, τὰς μὲν πόρνas ἐταίρας . . . . καλοῦντας, πρώτου Σόλωνος ἦν ὡς ἔοικε σόφισμα τὴν τῶν χρεῶν ἀποκοπὴν σεισάχθειαν ὀνομάσαντος. τοῦτο γὰρ ἐποίησατο πρῶτον πολίτευμα γραφῆς τὰ μὲν ὑπάρχοντα τῶν χρεῶν ἀνεῖσθαι, πρὸς δὲ τὸ λοιπὸν ἐπὶ τοῖς σώμασι μηδὲνα δανείζειν.. Diog Laert. 1, 45 (Anon. *De incred.* 23) Σόλων Ἐξηκεστίδου Σαλαμίνιος πρῶτον μὲν τὴν  
 10 σεισάχθειαν εἰσηγήσατο Ἀθηναίους· τὸ δὲ ἦν λύτρωσις σωμαμάτων τε καὶ κτημάτων. Diodor. 1, 79, 4 (= Hekataios of Abdera 264 F 25) δοκεῖ δὲ καὶ τοῦτον τὸν νόμον ὁ Σόλων εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας μετενεγκεῖν (*scil. ἐξ Αἰγύπτου*), ὃν ὀνόμασε σεισάχθειαν, ἀπολύσας τοὺς πολίτας ἅπαντας τῶν ἐπὶ τοῖς σώμασι πεπιστευμένων δανείων. Dionys. Hal. *A. R.* 5, 65, 1 ἄφειον χρεῶν ψηφισαμένην (*scil.*  
 15 τὴν Ἀθηναίων πόλιν) τοῖς ἀπόροις, Σόλωνος καθηγησαμένην.

The *Synagoge* (transcribed by Photios and the *Suda*) followed a lexicographic source which, in the customary manner of these lexica <sup>5</sup>), quoted a systematic and a historical work, *viz.* Aristotle's Ἀθπ. (always first consulted for matters concerning Athenian constitutional develop-  
 20 ment) and Ph. The latter was selected from among the Atthidographers in this case because he stated something about the form of Solon's much contested action, which according to tradition was not part of the legislation proper but preceded it <sup>6</sup>). If Ph. used the term ἀποψηφίζεῖν (and in view of Dionysios' ψηφίζεσθαι and Plutarch's γράφειν it seems certain  
 25 that he did) his purpose is clear: though, like Aristotle, he rejected the tendencious explanation of Androtion (324 F 34) and took *σεισάχθεια* in its literal sense, nevertheless he agreed with him so far as he also wished to exculpate Solon from the charge of having taken a revolutionary measure <sup>7</sup>).

30 Between the two authors quoted the source of the *Synagoge* (still following Aristotle, but deliberately substituting ἄχθος for βάρος) inserted the explanation of the term *σεισάχθεια* (εἴρηται — ἀποσεισασθαι). It contains the erroneous statement (for which the use of the present tense καλοῦσιν by Aristotle may be partly to blame) that the *σεισάχθεια*  
 35 was a permanent institution (ἔθος ἦν Ἀθήνησι). As a matter of fact, Solon's measure is the only known case in Athenian history of a complete cancelling of debts, often though here as elsewhere the demand was raised in later times for χρεωκοπία and γῆς ἀναδαμός.

(115) Herodt. 5, 62, 2 Ἰππίεω τυραννεύοντος καὶ ἐμπικραινομένου

Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.)

Ἀθηναῖοι διὰ τὸν Ἰππάρχου θάνατον Ἀλκμεωνίδαι, γένος ἐόντες Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ φεύγοντες Πεισιστρατίδας, ἐπειτε σφι ἅμα τοῖσι ἄλλοισι Ἀθηναίων φυγάσι πειρωμένοι κατὰ τὸ ἰσχυρὸν οὐ προεχώρει [κάτοδος (del Krueger)], ἀλλὰ προσέπταιον μεγάλας πειρώμενοι κατιέναι τε καὶ ἐλευθεροῦν τὰς Ἀθήνας

5 Λειψύδριον τὸ ὑπὲρ Παιονίης<sup>1)</sup> τειχίσαντες, ἐνταῦθα οἱ Ἀλκμεωνίδαι πᾶν ἐπὶ τοῖσι Πεισιστρατίδησι μηχανώμενοι παρ' Ἀμφικτυόνων τὸν νῆον μισθοῦνται τὸν ἐν Δελφοῖσι τὸν νῦν ἐόντα, τότε δὲ οὐκω, τοῦτον ἐξοικοδομησαι. (3) οἶα δὲ χρημάτων εὖ ἤκοντες καὶ ἐόντες ἄνδρες δόκιμοι ἀνάκαθεν ἔτι, τὸν τε νῆον ἐξεργάσαντο τοῦ παραδείγματος κάλλιον, τὰ τε ἄλλα καὶ συγκειμένον

10 σφι παρίνου λίθου ποιέειν τὸν νῆον, Παρίου τὰ ἐμπροσθε αὐτοῦ ἐξεποίησαν. Aristot. Ἀθπ. 19, 3 οἱ φυγάδες ὧν οἱ Ἀλκμεωνίδαι προειστήκεσαν αὐτοὶ μὲν δι' αὐτῶν οὐκ ἐδύναντο ποιήσασθαι τὴν κάθοδον, ἀλλ' αἰεὶ προσέπταιον . . . (4) ἀποτυγχάνοντες οὖν ἐν ἅπασι τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐμισθώσαντο τὸν ἐν Δελφοῖς νεὸν οἰκοδομῆσαι<sup>2)</sup>, ὅθεν εὐπόρησαν χρημάτων πρὸς τὴν τῶν Λακωνῶν βοήθει-

15 αν<sup>3)</sup>. Schol. Demosth. 21, 144 (IX 623 Ddf)<sup>3a)</sup> . . . ὁ Μεγακλῆς συνῆψε τὴν θυγατέρα τῷ Πεισιστράτῳ. χρωμένον δ' αὐτῇ παρὰ φύσιν ἐκείνου, προέμενος ὁ Μεγακλῆς τὴν θυγατέρα ἀφείλκυσε καὶ ὠιχετο αὐτὸς εἰς Δελφούς. τότε δὲ ἐμπρησθέντος τοῦ νεῶ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἐκήρυξαν οἱ Δελφοὶ τὸν βουλόμενον μισθώσασθαι πρὸς κατασκευὴν τοῦ νεῶ. ὁ Μεγακλῆς οὖν ἐδέξατο,

20 καὶ λαβῶν δέκα τάλαντα τρία μὲν ἀνήλωσεν εἰς τὴν κατασκευὴν, ἐκ δὲ τῶν ἑπτὰ δυνάμιν τινα συνήθροισε, καὶ πείσας Λακεδαιμονίους βοηθεῖν ἐπὶ τὰς Ἀθήνας Πεισιστράτην μὲν οὐκέτι ζῶντα κατέλαβεν, Ἰππίαν δὲ τὸν ἐκείνου παῖδα τυραννοῦντα ἐξέβαλεν. Pindar *Pyth.* 7, 1 ff. (486 B.C.) Κάλλιστον αἰ μεγαπόλιες Ἀθῆναι προοίμιον Ἀλκμανιδᾶν εὐρυσθενεῖ γενεᾷ

25 κρηπιδ' αἰοιδᾶν ἵπποισι βαλέσθαι . . . / πάσαισι γὰρ πολίεσι λόγος ὁμιλεῖ Ἐρεχθέος ἀστῶν, Ἄπολλον, οἱ ἴτεόν τε δόμον<sup>4)</sup> Πυθῶνι δίαί θαητὸν ἔτευξαν. Isokrat. *Anitidos.* 232 (following him Demosth. 21, 144) Κλεισθένης ἐκπεσὼν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ὑπὸ τῶν τυράννων λόγῳ πείσας τοὺς Ἀμφικτυόνας δανεῖσαι τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ χρημάτων αὐτῷ, τὸν τε δῆμον κατήγαγε καὶ τοὺς

30 τυράννους (τοὺς Πεισιστράτου παῖδας Demosth.) ἐξέβαλε. — Pausan. 10, 5, 13 τέταρτος (*scil.* ναός) δὲ ὑπὸ Τροφονίου μὲν εἰργάσθη καὶ Ἀγαμήδους . . . κατεκαύθη δὲ Ἐρξικλείδου μὲν Ἀθήνησιν ἄρχοντος, πρώτῳ δὲ τῆς ὀγδόης Ὀλυμπιάδος ἔπει καὶ πεντηχοστῆς, ἣν Κροτωνιάτης ἐνίκα Διόγνητος (548/7). τὸν δ' ἐφ' ἡμῶν τῷ θεῷ ναὸν ὠικοδόμησαν μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερῶν οἱ

35 Ἀμφικτύονες χρημάτων, ἀρχιτέκτων δὲ τις Σπίνθαρος ἐγένετο αὐτοῦ Κορινθίος<sup>5)</sup>. Euseb. Hier. *Kan.* ol. 57, 4 = 549/8 B.C. (58, 2 Arm.) *templum Apollinis Delphici secunda vice incensum*<sup>6)</sup>.

The tradition about the share of the Alcmeonids in the building of the Delphic temple uniformly agrees in the statement that they took the

contract during the last years before the expulsion of Hippias in 511/0 B.C., after the murder of Hipparchos at the Panathenaia of 514 B.C. and the failure of the attempt at overthrowing the tyrannis by force of arms from Leipsydriion 7). The most definite statement is that of the excerpt from Ph. 8) who distinguishes the promise and vow (of the year 513 B.C.) from its fulfilment 'after the victory'. This is in full accordance with the account of Aristotle, which becomes itself intelligible from this starting-point 9), but (while it fixes the *terminus post*) it leaves a wide range of possible dates for the completion of the building. For though 10 regretably the excerptor omitted the archon in whose year Ph. placed it, the latter (like all other authors from Herodotos onwards) quite correctly always talks of 'the Peisistratids', *i.e.* the sons of Peisistratos 10); and since the fragment with the list of archons *Agora* I 4120 has yielded Kleisthenes as the archon of the year 525/4 B.C. (between Hippias and 15 Miltiades), we know that we are dealing with the second exile of the Alcmeonids which Meritt has assumed with the greatest probability 11) to be one of the consequences of the murder of Hipparchos. There does not seem to be any doubt that this tradition made the Alcmeonids enter into the contract only after 514/3 B.C., or (to express it more cautiously) 20 did not know anything about an earlier building activity in Delphi 12). If the entire literary tradition about this point really derives from one source ultimately, as is almost generally agreed, this source actually was not Herodotos (who did not even understand the purpose of the Alcmeonids in taking over the contract), it was the tradition about the history of the 25 building of the temple which he received at Delphi and combined with the history of the clan as he had heard it from their relatives in Athens 13). That the tradition Herodotos gave was Delphic is shown by his statements about the contributions to the temple-building (2, 180), and we cannot very well doubt that the documentary tradition published by Aristotle and Men- 30 aichmos 14), which yielded a Delphic date for so early an event as the Holy War, dated both the burning down of the temple and the more or less important events connected with it. The same tradition about the Holy War shows that one was able to correlate the Delphic eponyms with the Attic; with what degree of correctness we do not know, but there is no reason 35 for doubting the completeness and the authenticity of the Delphic list from about 590 B.C., for from the fact that we have no Delphic dates of the years 513/2 B.C. ff. we must not infer that there were none.

The case for the defence is fairly strong, and numismatic evidence makes it even stronger 15). That we call it a case for the defence is entirely due to

the doubts raised by Humfry Payne <sup>16</sup>), who assigned the so-called Antenor Kore from the Akropolis to the very beginning of his Ripe Archaic Period 'about 530 B.C.' <sup>17</sup>) and who, on the strength of an 'obvious likeness' between her and the female attendants, the Korai of the Delphic pediments <sup>18</sup>), questioned the correctness of Herodotos' statement. He is inclined to return to the theory of Pomtow <sup>19</sup>) 'that the Alcmeonid connexion with the temple may reach back much farther than the date given in Hdt. 5, 62'. Now, I will not dispute here Payne's general principle (fraught with dangers though it is) that 'the literary evidence must surely be considered in the light of the general testimony of the monuments', and I readily grant his contention 'that the matter is still one for discussion', but I am somewhat doubtful about the conclusion he draws as to the literary tradition, and inclined to contest the statement with which he follows up the general principle that 'it is fairly plain that this does not support Herodotos' version of the events'. The question is about two points: the style of the Korai and the architecture of the temple of the Alcmeonids. In regard to the former Payne himself expresses his opinion so cautiously that his result is certainly not sufficient for refuting Herodotos' date of the marble façade; for even though he does not absolutely exclude the possibility that the Athenian and the Delphic Korai were done by the same artist he does state 'considerable differences' and concludes with the following words: 'it will be safer, therefore, to say no more than that the sculptor of the pediments had seen and studied Antenor's Kore . . . . it is certainly earlier than the pediments; how much earlier, since we do not yet know the exact date of the pediments, it is impossible to say' <sup>20</sup>). Just the reverse, but equally clear, is the chronological relation in regard to architecture between the Hekatompedon on the Akropolis, built during the years 520-510 B.C., and the temple of the Alcmeonids. Weickert <sup>21</sup>), whom Payne follows here, stated that the 'Peisistratid temple of Athena on the Akropolis is later than the architecture of the Alcmeonid temple', but he did not feel this to be a reason for disputing the dating of the share of the Alcmeonids in 513-505 B.C.: 'evidently the eastern pediment and the opulent decoration of the pronaos is due to them; the ornament of the door clearly points to a later time than the beginning of the building'. Everything considered, the situation appears to me less simple than it did to Payne, who assumed that we only had to state a 'slip of Herodotos', easily to be corrected by 'the general testimony of the monuments'. The actual difficulty (and because of it I agree with Payne that 'the matter



is still one for discussion') is the incompleteness of our literary tradition, which refers only to one stage of the history of the building, and that the last <sup>22</sup>). For this stage it is most desirably confirmed by numismatic evidence, and though this evidence does not yield a fixed date it excludes 5 absolutely the time of Peisistratos and, presumably, the decade 530/20 as well. But at what time the building was begun; whether it was carried out without cessation; whether the Amphiktyones, after having first fixed a sum for the building <sup>23</sup>), gave the contract at once or in sections for the whole sacred precinct or for parts of it <sup>24</sup>); whether the Alcmeonids had something to do with it from the start, or at least at some 10 early time; whether they were the first contractors, or entered into an original contract, or merely took over one (the last) part of a section; when they actually carried out this part; what artists they called in; and how long it took until the temple was actually finished <sup>25</sup>)—all 15 these are questions we can raise but not answer. We are not in possession of Delphic documents, and the Athenian tradition, being the only one at our disposal, quite naturally but onesidedly concerns itself exclusively with the Alcmeonids and the attempts at enforcing the return of the exiled clans from their second exile: Leipsydriion, the building of the temple, 20 the corruption of the Pythia, the help of Sparta—facts and fables, rumours and slander, everything refers to that time.

As to the only discrepancy in our literary tradition, *viz.* the disagreement between Herodotos on the one hand and the orators and Atthidographers on the other <sup>26</sup>) in regard to the raising of the money for the building 25 by the Alcmeonids (and incidentally for the preparation of the attack on Athens), it is, of course, possible to argue the thesis that the Atthidographic tradition merely is a 'rationalistic' correction of Herodotos' report <sup>27</sup>). But the difficulties of this thesis become insurmountable when we credit the nucleus of the report which consists in the dealings the 30 Alcmeonids had with Delphi and their share in the building of the temple after Leipsydriion. And this we must credit because of Pindar and the coins, not to mention general considerations (the transition to marble, as in the Hekatompedon; the Attic character of the style in the pediments; the continued close relations of Kleisthenes to Delphi after the overthrow 35 of the tyrants <sup>28</sup>). In fact, the thesis seems to me to be founded on a wrong judgement of the literary tradition, on the naive overestimate of what it yields, and on an even more fatal underestimate of what is lost to us with the fourth century books about Delphi and with the *Atthides*. It would then be better honestly to confess that we know nothing at all

of the history of the building of the temple. The course of events, as it has come down to us uniformly through Herodotos and the Atthidographers, is credible from the historical point of view: the support of the exiled Athenian aristocrats brought about by a clan which for a 5 century had maintained close relations with Delphi, is well in accord with what we know about Delphi's attitude towards the tyrants; this during the second half of the sixth century is uniform and undoubted. Nor is there any reason to doubt that Sparta, as Herodotos maintains, was determined by the Delphic oracle to intervene <sup>29</sup>), thus acting 10 against one of her chief principles of policy (just before, in 519/8 B.C., she had refused to take an interest in Middle Greece), an action she had to repent of not much later. All this could have been perceived long ago, and recently the almost documentary confirmation of a second exile of the Alcmeonids, not by Peisistratos but by 'the Peisistratids', has 15 finally shaken the foundations of Pomtow's theory. As a matter of fact, modern historians might have inferred this from the uniform tradition instead of bringing Peisistratos into the account of the fire and the rebuilding of the temple <sup>30</sup>). Also the fact that the Alcmeonidai (and the Eteobutadai) coined electron and put the Δ of Delphi on the coins has 20 furnished a further reason for accepting the Atthidographic tradition as being correct <sup>31</sup>): the exiles really returned with Delphic money <sup>32</sup>); Delphi engaged with them in a speculation (one may call it that) promising advantages to both partners, for the success of which, however, the intervention of Sparta was vital. In order to bring her in no corruption of the 25 Pythia was needed, and Herodotos reports the obvious slander as a λεγόμενον. In these circumstances we had better admit the actual mistake of Herodotos (easily explained as it is) who apparently makes the Alcmeonids build the whole temple out of their own money, incidentally shifting the date of the work done by them at Delphi before their return 30 to Athens; for the rest, however, we had better keep to his facts and to his chronology, until decisive evidence is brought forward either that the Alcmeonids built the whole temple, or that the contract given by Delphi to Kleisthenes (and incidentally his second exile) falls before the murder of Hipparchos in 514 B.C. <sup>33</sup>).

35 (116) Plutarch. *Them.* 10, 10 ἐν οἷς ἱστορεῖται κύων Ξανθίππου τοῦ Περικλέους πατὴρ οὐκ ἀνασχόμενος τὴν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ μόνωσιν ἐναλέσθαι τῇ θαλάττῃ, καὶ τῇ τριήρει παρανηχόμενος ἐκπεσεῖν εἰς τὴν Σαλαμίνα, καὶ λιποθυμήσας ἀποθανεῖν εὐθύς· οὗ καὶ τὸ δεικνύμενον ἄχρι νῦν καὶ καλούμενον Κυνὸς σῆμα τάφον εἶναι λέγουσιν. *Id. Cato mai.* 5. 4. Aelians' mention-

ing a plural number of dogs may be negligence, but it is not at all self-evident that it is from Ph. that Plutarch draws <sup>1)</sup>. The citation is anonymous and there is nothing in the anecdote characteristic of his manner; the impressive description of the embarkation <sup>2)</sup> may as well come from Kleidemos (323 F 21) cited just before; in Plutarch's *Cato* examples of the ἡμερότης of the Athenians towards animals <sup>3)</sup> are enumerated which may have occurred anywhere. But it is self-evident that Ph. did not cite Aristotle on behalf of the story about the dog; moreover, we know now that it did not occur in the Ἀθπ., which only gives the political-ly biased answer to the question how the costs of maintenance for the men of the fleet were provided, and Aristotle does not even deal with this point in the narrative, but mentions it as the foundation of the leading political position of the Areopagos in the next two decades <sup>4)</sup>. We cannot decide, nor is it of real importance for us, whether Aristotle told the anecdote about the dog in any other of his books, as in *H. A.* 6, 24 he mentioned the mule pensioned off in order to prove the advanced age attained by these animals; whether Ps. Aristotle is meant, or whether the quotation of Aelianus is wrong. But one must not alter Aelian's Ἀριστοτέλης to Ἀνδροτίων.

<sup>20</sup> (117) We may infer from the mode of citing that there were no essential discrepancies between the various Atthidographers as to the historical facts. Some of the particulars to which Aristophanes alludes are given in Schol. 1144 <sup>1)</sup>: Κίμων· μετὰ τὴν ἐν Πλαταιαῖς μάχην (479/8) † ἰβ̄ ἔτει ὕστερον [[ταῦτα ἦν ἐπὶ Θεαγενίδου (468/7) ]]. καὶ γὰρ τοῦ Ταυ-  
<sup>25</sup> γέτου τι παρερράγη, καὶ τὸ ὠιδεῖον καὶ ἕτερα καὶ οὐκίαι πλεῖσται, καὶ Μεσσηνιοὶ ἀποστάντες ἐπολέμουν, καὶ οἱ εἰλωτες ἐπέστησαν, ἕως Κίμων ἐλθὼν διὰ τὴν Ἰκετηρίαν ἔσωσεν αὐτούς. The statement of the interval <sup>2)</sup> in itself shows that this report belongs together with Schol. 1138, i.e. it ultimately also derives from Ph.s *Atthis*, which is the main Atthidographic source of the Scholia.  
<sup>30</sup> But it has passed through several hands and has been abbreviated and trivialized <sup>3)</sup>. Moreover, it is not quite clear whether the earthquake or (which is more probable not only because of the wording <sup>4)</sup>) the expedition of Kimon to Ithome is the event to be dated, and (most important of all) the number ἰβ̄ is corrupt <sup>5)</sup>.

<sup>35</sup> Since the dating of the earthquake by Diodoros at 469/8 B.C. finds followers again and again <sup>6)</sup> the evidence must be presented and briefly discussed. It is seemingly abundant, as we have four witnesses. I begin deliberately with the three later ones who simply date the earthquake or the revolt of the Messenians by a fixed year: (1) Plutarch *Kimōn* 16, 4

Ἀρχιδάμου τοῦ Ζευξιδάμου τέταρτον ἔτος ἐν Σπάρτῃ βασιλεύοντος. Even if, or rather particularly if, the date derives from local tradition (which is possible but not at all certain) it is difficult to use, for we do not know either the local Spartan kings' list or the local Spartan mode of calculating.

5 If it derives from a synchronistic chronicle, and if Archidamos (as is generally assumed) became king in 469/8 B.C. we have the choice between 466/5 and 465/4 B.C. 7). (2) Diodoros II, 63/4 narrates the earthquake and the revolt of the Messenians, which was caused by it, under the year 469/8 B.C. 8). This, according to the usual reckoning, is the

10 first year of Archidamos; according to Diodoros' own chronology (which, as everybody knows, is hopelessly muddled for the reigns of the Spartan kings of the fifth century) it is his eighth. I have not much doubt that his source (Ephoros) did not give the year, but simply began the story of Archidamos' reign with the great earthquake. In any case and apart

15 from this confusion, Diodoros discredits his own date by giving the duration of the revolt as ten years and at the same time assigning its end to 456/5 B.C. 9). A war of ten years ending in 456/5 B.C. obviously did not begin in 469/8, but in 465/4. As Diodoros took the year of the termination of the war from his chronological handbook this source made the so-called

20 Third Messenian War last from 465/4 to 456/5, and consequently dated the earthquake (which is the ἀρχή, not the αἰτία of the war) in 465/4, which may or may not be the year implied also by Plutarch. (3) Pausanias 4, 24, 5 dates the revolt (not the earthquake) in 464/3: Μεσσηνίων δὲ τοὺς ἐγκαταλειφθέντας ἐν τῇ γῆι, συντελοῦντας κατὰ ἀνάγκην ἐς τοὺς

25 εἰλωτας, ἐπέλαβεν ἀπὸ Λακεδαιμονίων ὕστερον ἀποστῆναι κατὰ τὴν ἐνάτην Ὀλυμπιάδα καὶ ἑβδομηκοστὴν, ἣν Κορίνθιος ἐνίκα Ξενοφῶν, Ἀρχιμήδους 10) Ἀθήνησιν ἄρχοντος (464/3 B.C.)· ἀπέστησαν δὲ καιρὸν τοιοῦνδε εὐρόντες κτλ. Again there is no doubt that Pausanias took the initial date from his ordinary synchronistic tables, adding the aitiological narrative

30 from his Messenian source 11). (4) Thukydides narrates the period between the battle at the Eurymedon and the revolt of Egypt against the Persians, or (let us state at once the real purpose of this section) the rupture between Athens and Sparta in I, 100-103. His report is truly admirable, circumstantial, and (for obvious reasons) most carefully

35 written, though, of course, here too his idiosyncrasy of eschewing archons' dates with the resulting almost complete absence of a working chronology makes itself felt grievously. Nevertheless, for those who are not convinced *a priori* that they know better than Thukydides, but are prepared to read his report as carefully as he has written it, the chronological defect

can be remedied to a certain degree. The report <sup>12</sup>) is to be divided into two sections which briefly and *a potiori* may be inscribed as (I) 'Athens and Thasos' (100, 2-101, 3) and (II) 'Athens and Sparta' (102-103). The first section can be subdivided again into two parts: (a) Thasos secedes 5 from the League 'some time after' (χρόνοι ὕστερον) the battle at the Eurymedon, the dispute being about their factories and mines on the opposite coast of Thrace (at the mouth of the river Strymon). The Athenians send a fleet against the island which, after vanquishing the Thasian ships, lands troops investing the town, and at the same time (ὅπῳ 10 τούς αὐτούς χρόνους emphasizes the simultaneousness; otherwise μὲν — δὲ would have been sufficient) they send colonists to the Strymon district, who after founding a settlement at the Edonian place of Ennea Hodoi (afterwards called Amphipolis) are annihilated by the allied Thracians at Drabeskos (ch. 100, 2-3). (b) The besieged Thracians apply for help to 15 Sparta, and the Spartans promise assistance <sup>13</sup>). However, they cannot fulfil their pledge because the earthquake and the ensuing revolt of the helots intervene; thus, the Thasians have to come to terms with Athens at last—τρίτωι ἔπει πολιορκούμενοι (ch. 101) <sup>14</sup>). The second section (II) also has two parts: (a) Sparta, when the Messenian war dragged on, 20 asks help from Athens, obtains it (the Athenians sending a strong force under Kimon) and (obviously at the end of the same war year: ἐκ ταύτης τῆς στρατείας) sends it back with a polite excuse (102, 1-3). (b) Athens draws her conclusions: εὐθὺς ἐπειδὴ ἀνεχώρησαν, ἀφέντες τὴν γενομένην ἐπὶ τῶι Μήδωι ξυμμαχίαν πρὸς αὐτούς, she concludes an alliance with Argos 25 and Thessaly which Megara joins (102, 4; 103, 4) <sup>15</sup>), καὶ Κορινθίοις μὲν οὐχ ἥκιστα ἀπὸ τοῦδε τὸ σφοδρὸν μῖσος ἤρξατο πρῶτον ἐς Ἀθηναίους γενέσθαι. The concluding words show why Thukydides deals so fully, with so much detail and care, with this series of events: we have arrived at the great turning-point whence a straight line leads to the decisive fight about the 30 hegemony, the πόλεμος τῶν Πελοποννησίων καὶ Ἀθηναίων which is the theme of Thukydides' work.

We must reconcile ourselves to the fact that the historian strictly confines himself to 'foreign policy', not touching with one word on the change in the Athenian 'government' although this change was necessary 35 for the re-orientation of foreign policy, and although it created something more lasting than the federal system of 462/1. This gap, grievous though it is, does not alter the pre-eminence of the report as far as it goes. We may also regret that Thukydides, the inexorable stickler for principle, with his criticism of Hellanikos' chronology fresh in his mind, does not

date either the beginning or the end of the critical period. In our opinion an archon's name here would not have done his precious principles any harm, it would have helped even his contemporary readers greatly, and it would make all the difference in the world for the later readers of the κτῆμα ἐς ἀεί. It is, however, no use to quarrel with a great thinker even if his sticking to principles amounts to pig-headedness<sup>16</sup>). But granted those principles, it is even more regrettable that he seems to avoid almost perversely (but, in fact, he probably could not find out some of the exact dates) giving us natural years and months with one exception, *viz.* the three years, or more accurately the more than two years, of the siege of Thasos. Even so, the situation is not so bad as it looks: there is (thanks to Thukydides) not the least doubt about the relative order of events, for certain synchronisms and certain intervals emerge more or less clearly: the sending of a battle fleet against Thasos and of a transport fleet with colonists for Ennea Hodoi synchronize; the naval victory over the Thasian ships is followed immediately by the disembarkation of the besieging army, and the Thasians probably lost no time in asking for Spartan help. Take the summer of the first year for the invasion of Thasos and the settling at Ennea Hodoi; the following winter is amply sufficient for the negotiations in Sparta; in the spring or in the opening summer of the second year a Spartan expeditionary force would have been sent out to help the Thasians if the earthquake had not upset the plan. At the other end of the critical period again a winter and a summer are quite sufficient for the embassy of Sparta to Athens, the expedition of Kimon, and the complete change in the foreign policy of Athens, for Thukydides states expressly that the return of Kimon's army was followed immediately (εὐθὺς ἐπεὶ ἀνεχώρησαν) by the rupture with Sparta. Now it is of no use to argue that the Spartans asked for help in Athens at about the time when Thasos surrendered to the Athenians. Things may have happened like that, but ἐμῆκύνετο ὁ πόλεμος is a vague expression, and it almost seems as if the exact time of the earthquake was not known accurately to the Athenian writers. Fortunately we are able to date from Athenian sources not only the Thasian revolt or (rather) the events in Thrace soon following it, but also the change in Athenian policy. For there can be no reasonable doubt that the upshot of Kimon's expedition, on which he had staked his political reputation, carrying through the help for Sparta against strong opposition in the Council and the Assembly, determined at the same time the change in home politics<sup>17</sup>). The Attic year 465/4 B.C. is attested for the capture

of Ennea Hodoi and the defeat at Drabeskos <sup>18</sup>); for the consequences of Kimon's expedition to Ithome we confidently infer from Aristotle the Attic year 462/1 <sup>19</sup>). These dates being established, no amount of learning or sophistry, of splitting hairs and distorting the clear and carefully written account of Thukydides; no changing of his text in subordinate passages (duration of the Messenian war); no producing of elaborate theories about strata in a perfectly coherent report, will bring the earthquake back from 464 to 468 B.C. or into any year preceding the defection of Thasos <sup>20</sup>). We do not know whether Thukydides could have given us the archon of the year of the earthquake, but we can easily understand that the later chronological tables, which were dependent on his report, wavered between the two Attic years 465/4 and 464/3 B.C. (if they did waver): it is quite conceivable that in Athens people were not acquainted with the exact time of an event occurring in secretive Sparta, and if people knew the month or even the day in 464 B.C., that it was forgotten when about sixty years later Hellanikos wrote the first history of the Pentekontaetia. In fact, there were two events, the earthquake and the capture of Ithome by the insurgents; and some confusion in later writers may have arisen from that fact, too. But the main point is that probably no Atthidographer at all told of the earthquake or of the Messenian revolt *suo anno*. What evidence we have leads to the supposition that they all narrated at some length the embassy led by Perikleidas and its consequences. They reported the discussions about the Spartan demand (of which we know something from our sources) and the decrees passed in the Assembly concerning the help to be given to Sparta, the expedition of Kimon to Ithome, his return, the indignation in Athens, the negotiations with Argos, the ensuing discussions in the Assembly, the conclusions of the new alliances as well as the constitutional changes and the ostracism of Kimon, probably distributing these events over the two years 463/2 (second part) and 462/1 B.C., and from the starting-point of the embassy they gave a retrospective survey perhaps of the development of the relations between Sparta and Athens since the Xerxes War, and certainly (exactly as the comic poet did) of the reasons for the embassy and the Spartan demand.

Returning now to Ph. it seems fairly clear that he (or whoever is used in the scholion on *Lysistrate* 1144) meant to define the interval between the battle of Plataiai in 479/8 B.C., which chronographically is the first year of the new period (the year of the Περσικά 480/79 B.C., as is usual with epochal years, not included), and the first year of the next. To

this year Ph. (here we are quite sure of the name, as he is quoted for the expression) assigns the taking over of the *hegemonia* by Athens. It is quite correct to say that she was able to take over on account of the misfortunes which had befallen Sparta; but it would be wrong to assume

5 that an Atthidographer delimited a period of Athenian history by the Xerxes War on the one side and the Spartan misfortunes on the other, instead of by an Athenian event made possible or caused by those misfortunes and their consequences which eventually changed the relations between Sparta and Athens finally. We know from Thukydides himself

10 that there was an interval of some length (*i.e.* at least one year) between those two events: Λακεδαιμόνιοι δέ, ὡς αὐτοῖς πρὸς τοὺς ἐν Ἰθώμῃ ἐμῆκύνετο ὁ πόλεμος. I therefore propose to change β̄ to ῑ (an easy change palaeographically): the period delimited by Ph. comprises the eighteen years 479/8-462/1 B.C. (both terms included, as is usual in such state-

15 ments). If further confirmation is needed it is furnished by Aristotle who, most probably taking his dates from Androtion, tells us that ἔτη δὲ ἑπτακαίδεκα μάλιστα μετὰ τὰ Μηδικὰ διέμεινεν ἡ πολιτεία προεστῶτων τῶν Ἀρεοπαγιτῶν . . . . ἔπειτα τῆς βουλῆς ἐπὶ Κόνωνος ἄρχοντος (462/1) ἅπαντα περιεῖλε (*scil.* Ἐφιάλτης) τὰ ἐπιθετα κτλ. <sup>21</sup>). It is no surprise for us either

20 that Ph. agrees with Androtion, or that both define the period primarily from the point of view of home politics. Only primarily, not wholly, as Aristotle does, who is writing an Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία, not an Ἀτθίς: the expression which Ph. uses (there is not the least reason to distrust the scholion on *Lysistrate* 1138, where he is cited) refers to the leadership

25 which Athens won by the misfortunes of Sparta, an absolute leadership not qualified by τῆς θαλάττης or even τῶν συμμάχων <sup>22</sup>). As Ph. probably began a new book of the *Atthis*, the fourth, with the great turn in Athenian policy in 462/1 B.C., and as this same book contained the Peloponnesian War <sup>23</sup>), we state a clear difference between him and Thukydides who,

30 while strongly marking the change of 462/1 B.C., regards the next thirty years as still a sort of training (or manoeuvring) for the supreme contest <sup>24</sup>). In the century and more that lies between him and the *Atthis* of Ph. there has been a change in the historical outlook which shifted the epochal year from 432/1 B.C. back to 462/1 and replaced the Thucydidean Pentekontaetia by a period which (perhaps in agreement with Ph.'s own view)

35 we may call 'The Rise and Fall of the Athenian Empire'. The change in itself does not ask for a special explanation, it is a natural one; but it should imply a valuation of Perikles which is much more positive than the somewhat lukewarm and half-hearted appreciation which during



the fourth century seems to have prevailed in moderate conservative circles <sup>25</sup>). A book containing and treating as a historical unit the period from 462/1 to 404/3 seems to be founded on the idea of a 'Periclean age'; it seems to view the Athens of Perikles and the Athenian empire in almost the same light in which they were seen by Thukydides. In any case, it seems to me a rather disastrous misconception to speak in this connexion (or for the matter of that in the appreciation of Solon) simply of the democratic view-point or of a 'democratic colouring' of the 'Atthis' <sup>26</sup>). What we observe in Ph. (and what may have been the case already in

<sup>10</sup> Androktion) is either just the reverse, *viz.* robbing 'democracy' of its heroes, not only of Solon, but of Kleisthenes and Perikles as well, claiming them for the μέσοι, the moderate party; or it is not a political appreciation at all but a historical one, based on Thukydides and already in some distinctive parts of Ph.s work not quite without the glamour of

<sup>15</sup> a great past.

(118) Thukyd. I, 114 μετά δὲ ταῦτα (defeat at Koroneia) οὐ πολλῶν ὕστερον Εὐβοία ἀπέστη ἀπὸ Ἀθηναίων, καὶ ἐς αὐτὴν διαβεβηκότες ἦδη Περικλέους στρατιᾶι Ἀθηναίων, ἠγγέλθη αὐτῶι ὅτι Μέγαρα ἀφέστηκε καὶ Πελοποννήσιοι μέλλουσιν ἐσβαλεῖν ἐς τὴν Ἀττικὴν . . . (3) καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι

<sup>20</sup> πάλιν ἐς Εὐβοίαν διαβάντες Περικλέους στρατηγοῦντος κατεστρέψαντο πᾶσαν, καὶ τὴν μὲν ἄλλην ὁμολογίαι κατεστήσαντο, Ἔσθιαϊς δὲ ἐξοικίσαντες αὐτοὶ τὴν γῆν ἔσχον. The succinct annalistic entry, which may already have occurred in Hellanikos in this form, looks like having been passed on traditionally by the later Atthidographers <sup>1</sup>). We must not doubt

<sup>25</sup> φησὶν Φιλόχορος, for the Scholiasts, when explaining historical allusions, always consulted primarily an *Atthis*, preferably that of Ph., not the great historians in whom they could not expect to find the details they needed. In this case, however, the Scholiast, or better the abbreviated commentaries which (to judge from the Didymos papyrus) are all that we have,

<sup>30</sup> omitted both the details and the date <sup>2</sup>), being only concerned about the explanation of the word παρετάθη. The question must remain open how far Ph. went into the details. The quotation, preserved by chance, of a psephism of 442/1 B.C. with the archon's date, which may derive from an Atthidographer but may equally well come from Krateros <sup>3</sup>), does

<sup>35</sup> not decide anything. But judging by the analogy of *e.g.* F 49 ff., we expect that Ph. made at least those factual statements which we find in Diodoros, Theopompos, and his excerptors <sup>4</sup>). The entry as it is does not yield anything for answering the much-discussed question as to how legal conditions and ownership were arranged in the other towns of Euboeia <sup>5</sup>).

(119) Schol. Aristoph. *Plut.* 178 <sup>1</sup>); Plutarch. *Perikl.* 37, 3 ἀκμάζων ὁ Περικλῆς ἐν τῇ πολιτείᾳ πρὸ πάνυ πολλῶν χρόνων καὶ παιῶν ἔχων ὡσπερ εἶρηται γνησίους νόμους ἔγραψε (451/0 B.C.) μόνους Ἀθηναίους εἶναι τοὺς ἐκ δευῖν Ἀθηναίων γεγονότας. (4) ἐπεὶ δὲ τοῦ βασιλέως τῶν Αἰγυπτίων 5 δωρεὰς τῷ δήμῳ πέμψαντος τετρακισμυρίου πυρῶν μεδίμνους ἔδει διανεμῆσθαι τοὺς πολίτας, πολλαὶ μὲν ἀνεφύοντο δίκαι τοῖς νόμοις ἐκ τοῦ γράμματος ἐκείνου τέως διαλανθάνουσι καὶ παρορωμένοις, πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ συκοφαντή-  
μασι περιέπιπτον. ἐπράθησαν οὖν (Υ ἐπράχθησαν δ' οὖν S) ἀλόντες ὀλίγωι  
10 πεντακισχιλίων ἐλάττους, οἱ δὲ μείναντες ἐν τῇ πολιτείᾳ καὶ κριθέντες Ἀθη-  
ναῖοι μύριοι καὶ τετρακισχιλιοὶ καὶ τεσσαράκοντα τὸ πλῆθος ἐξητάσθησαν.

The pleading of Bdelykleon (*Vesp.* 650 ff.) is built up on the idea how great a profit the people might draw from its empire and how little its leaders let it actually have: as of the State's annual income in cash not even a tenth (v. 664) is used for payment of the jurors, thus instead of an 15 annual apportioning <sup>2</sup>) of fifty bushels (medimnoi) of Euboean wheat which could easily be procured, the people received at some time earlier and once only five bushels, and even that with the greatest difficulty. This single apportionment evidently is a historical fact, and the Scholia naturally try to determine the indefinite πρώην. It is perhaps intelligible 20 that in doing so they started from τὴν Εὐβοίαν: the commentator looked up in his *Atthis* the last mention of the island before the performance of the *Vespae* (423/2 B.C.), found it in the preceding year under the archon Isarchos, and, no distribution of corn being mentioned in 424/3 <sup>3</sup>), he had to assume that such a distribution was a regular, or at least a frequent, 25 event, connected with a formal scrutiny of the recipients. As this explanation obviously contradicted the text another commentator preferred to start from ξενίας φεύγων: he found in Ph. a distribution of Egyptian corn in 445/4 B.C., when there had been a scrutiny of the citizenship of applicants. Egypt was of no use for the poet who dreamt of an annual 30 distribution, but Euboea was easily explained: the island, always important for the feeding of Athens particularly during war-times, had been subjected again and (at least partly) settled with cleruchies in the preceding year 446/5 B.C., and this is the event to which Aristophanes alludes also in the *Clouds* (F 118). It was permanently present to his 35 mind, although we do not know why. This explanation is correct, though it elicited the remark of a reader (the interruption of the context of the scholion is evident) that there was something wrong with the numbers <sup>4</sup>).

Ph.s report about the distribution of corn in 445/4 B.C. is handed down in two versions. The Scholiast (Didymos?) looked up the *Atthis* itself

as the names of the archon and the donor show <sup>5</sup>); Plutarch who (with a vague indication of the time) inserted the story of gift and scrutiny into the touching account of how Perikles had to ask the people to dispense him from a law carried by himself <sup>6</sup>), probably found it in this place in his biographical source. The versions differ considerably. The discrepancies as to the numbers are of no great importance: as to the 14040 instead of 14240 recipients the hundreds have probably simply dropped out in Plutarch; his 'almost five thousand' *παρέγγραφοι* presuppose the exact number 4760, the round number and the lacking of the technical term being evidence of the intermediate source and of its character. Plutarch omitted accidentally or deliberately the five bushels per head; between the total number of 30000 (Schol.) and 40000 (Plut.) we cannot decide. The discrepancies as to the matter are, however, very grave. According to the Scholia Ph. said that on the occasion of the distribution 15 4760 *παρέγγραφοι* 'were found' (*ὄφθῆναι*), according to Plutarch his 'almost 5000' *ἐπράθησαν ἀλόντες*; the number 14240 is according to Ph. that of the recipients at the time (*οἱ λαβόντες*), according to Plutarch that of the citizens remaining after the scrutiny and acknowledged as such (*οἱ μείναντες ἐν τῇ πολιτείᾳ καὶ κριθέντες Ἀθηναῖοι*). These two 20 points actually are one and the same, and we may even confess at once to a bias for the direct quotation which is corroborated by an examination of the facts: whatever there is at the bottom of the story of a scrutiny of the Athenian citizen-body in 445/4 B.C. (we shall return to this question presently), 'the dreadful tale that at that time a quarter of the civil 25 population of Attica was deprived of its rights or even sold into slavery' must not only 'disappear from Greek history' <sup>7</sup>), it did not even occur in Ph.'s *Atthis*, at least not in this offensive form; and this is what primarily concerns us. The question of how Plutarch arrived at his impossible notion may perhaps be answered by simply referring to Gomme's treatment <sup>8</sup>) of the decree of Demophilos who in 346/5 B.C. *εισηγήσατο δια-* 30 *ψηφίσεις τῶν ἀστῶν ἐν τοῖς δήμοις*: the universal belief that in an *ἔφεσις ἐκ δημοτῶν* the unsuccessful appellants were sold into slavery indiscriminately, is due to the somewhat loose, or rather the incomplete, rendering of the law governing the annual scrutinies by Aristotle *Ἀθπ.* 42, 1, which 35 deceived all later writers; this penalty (if penalty it can be called, as in fact there was no loss of status) is imposed only *ἂν μὲν ἀποψηφίσωνται μὴ εἶναι ἐλεύθερον* (that is when a slave had passed himself off as a legitimate Athenian) and if the court finds accordingly (*κἂν μὲν μὴ δόξει δικαίως ἐγγράφεισθαι*). We have not the least reason to assume that Ph. shared the

error of Plutarch, Dionysios, and the lexicographers; he did not depend on Aristotle for his knowledge of the existing law, and he does not say that the alleged 4760 non-citizens were sold into slavery. As far as we can make out from the scholion, which is apparently trustworthy if rather  
 5 brief, his report is the following: ἐπὶ Λυσιμαχίδου (445/4 B.C.) a Libyan prince made Athens a gift of 30000 bushels of wheat; they were distributed among 14240 Athenians whereas 4760 were rejected. If Ph. used for the latter the term *παρέγγραφοι* in its technical meaning<sup>9)</sup> he must have assumed that in this year a thorough scrutiny of the citizen list  
 10 took place, *i.e.* that one instituted the procedure called *διαψηφισμός*, like that in 346/5 B.C. which he himself recorded in the sixth book of his *Atthis* (F 52). In regard to this report we have to put two questions: (1) what is at the bottom of the numbers? (2) what happened in 445/4 B.C. and what was the legal situation?

15 As to the first question we are rather helpless. It is generally admitted now that the statistical evidence about the population of Athens is highly unsatisfactory<sup>10)</sup>. The few direct statements are 'exasperatingly disputable' and for the present question fairly useless as they refer almost without exception (for the slave population and the metics do not  
 20 matter here) to a portion of the population which does not come into consideration for a distribution of corn, at least not primarily, *viz.* the hoplites, who may be roughly equated with the *zeugitai*. We have no numbers of the *thetes* anywhere (naturally enough): wherever the urban *ἄγλος*, or in military terms the *δμιλος ψιλῶν*, occurs, it is not counted<sup>11)</sup>;  
 25 and the naval population, the number of the sailors of the war-fleet, cannot be determined even approximately<sup>12)</sup>. In the present case one thing is certain, *viz.* that the two numbers 14240 and 4760 actually occurred in Ph., and that they are not corrupt because when added they yield the round number of 19000. But this very sum makes more than merely  
 30 plausible Beloch's assumption<sup>13)</sup> that we have here not two numbers handed down, but that one was obtained by subtracting the other from the total, and then there can be no doubt that it is the number of the *παρέγγραφοι* which was calculated; for the number of law-suits of a certain category a tradition did not exist and could not have existed,  
 35 but the number of recipients of corn may very well have been mentioned in the documents of the distributing board. We must assume (and it is a credible assumption) that Ph., whom without hesitation we have acquitted of misunderstanding the law implied in *ἐπράθησαν*, made the mistake (or took it over from his predecessor Androtion) of simply regard-

ing the rest as non-citizens. To modern discussion the scholion, as compared with Plutarch who evidently talks of the citizen list generally, has presented another difficulty: it does not state, at least not expressly, what Ph. meant by his 19000, and particularly not how he arrived at that number. Of the two possibilities considered by Beloch 'that he actually was in possession of a statement about the number of the *thetes* in the fifth century' or 'that he simply transferred the number of the citizens of his own time to the Periclean period' the former may be excluded at once according to what has been said above <sup>14</sup>). The second possibility however seems rather obvious: not because of Plutarch, but because we may *a priori* assume that Ph. intended to give the number of all Athenians who all had the same claim to the gift whether or not they actually applied <sup>15</sup>). It is true that the number of citizens given in the first census of Demetrios of Phaleron (*i.e.* in Ph.'s own time), which is generally regarded with a certain confidence, is somewhat higher, being 21000; but if we alter either passage we cut the ground from under our feet, not to mention the doubts raised in regard to the seemingly well attested number of Demetrios, which would greatly limit its usefulness <sup>16</sup>). The true difficulty consists in the fact that 19000 is not a really stereotyped number. The really stereotyped figures for the fifth (and also for the fourth) century are three or two myriads. The latter (and proper) figure is given for the Pentekontaetia by the pamphletist whom Aristotle *Aθπ.* 24, 3 follows and for the Archidamian War by Aristophanes in the same scene of the *Vespae* to which the scholion belongs <sup>17</sup>). In regard to both these authors, different though they are, and although the latter indulges in fancies and the former exaggerates tendenciously, there can be no doubt of their having in mind the total number of citizens who all live, or should live, on the Empire. This is important because it shows that a total of 19000 citizens is not simply incredible for Ph., even though (we do not know why) he gave 19000 instead of 20000 <sup>18</sup>). If, however, this stereotyped number is far too low, as is almost universally agreed at present <sup>19</sup>), we must confess that we cannot make any progress, and this is not surprising as we actually do not make headway with the figure of Demetrios either, although its coming from a census is attested <sup>20</sup>).

I am quite willing to believe that for a gift of corn the urban population not engaged in agriculture were the first, if not the only, persons to apply <sup>21</sup>); on the other hand, 'we may be sure that many a zeugite would have been glad of a gift of two or three medimni of corn' <sup>22</sup>); we also know for certain that by far not all the inhabitants of the town were *thetes*,

and conversely that not all thetes lived in the town. But I should not venture to level out these numbers in order to obtain the approximate total of the thetes, for instance to equate the zeugitai included in the 14240 with the thetes who were absent for whatever reasons. The number of claims, which in all probability is documentary, is certainly not unimportant, but it is difficult, if not impossible, to utilize it statistically even for the number of the thetes, though in view of our lack of statistical data proper we shall anyhow be grateful to Ph. for his figures; it is a clue less perhaps to the total population of Attica, or to the share of the thetes in it than to that of the city, and its negative significance may even be greater: if Ph. estimated or calculated the total number of all Athenians at 19000 that is a further warning against overestimating the value of ancient statistical statements even when made by good authors. This again is not altogether surprising because we know that the available material simply did not admit of really accurate statements. But it does surprise us again and again (and this is valid not only for Ph.) how wrongly they estimated.

Concerning the matter, *i.e.* what actually happened in 445/4 B.C., our position is perhaps not better, but rather worse. While the number of the recipients of corn is evidently the same in the Scholiast and in Plutarch (the slight corruption in the text of the latter being easily emended), their statements about the fate of those whose claims were rejected differ. The seemingly accurate tradition of Plutarch (*ἐπράθησαν ἀλόντες*) is incredible and could be proved wrong<sup>23</sup>), but that of the Scholiast is as vague as possible; while the exact figure of *παρέγγραφοι* at first sight favours the assumption that it was documentary, too, its character and its very highness make us reluctant to accept it. As I am not sure whether in the modern treatments of the events of 445/4 B.C. all the difficulties involved have really been considered, I find it desirable to state systematically all the questions to be raised in order to perceive clearly what we know and what we do not know, or at least what we do not know with certainty.

(1) The first question is: who had a claim to receive free corn in 445/4 B.C.? The natural answer for the fifth century would be that every Athenian had such a claim, and that it is irrelevant whether or not he made use of it. Actually Aristophanes makes no qualification except that resulting from the danger of a *γραφὴ ξενίας*, and Ph. said that the gift was made *τῷ δήμῳ*; if the *πέντε μέδμηνοι ἐκάστῳ Ἀθηναίων* are taken from him<sup>24</sup>) there did not exist, or he did not

know of, any decree of the people restricting its range. Accordingly the situation was the same in 445/4 B.C. as in Ph.s own time: in 299/8 B.C. the 10000 bushels of wheat given τῶι δήμῳι by king Lysimachos were distributed among 'all Athenians' <sup>25</sup>). Modern conjectures 'that the 5 distribution of corn in 445/4 B.C. was limited to the poorer part of the population' <sup>26</sup>) are due to the opinion that the number of 19000 is far too low for the total citizen body of Athens in that year. According to what we said above about these total figures there is altogether no foundation for an inference like that, which anyhow would not be con-  
10 clusive for Ph.s conception of matters.

(2) Who was an Athenian in 445/4 B.C.? On this question, too, a new light is thrown if we draw the conclusion from the suggestion that the alleged number of 4760 παρέγγραφοι is not documentary, but the (obviously incredible) result of a calculation <sup>26a</sup>). In this case, too, the  
15 answer seems to be obvious: in 445/4 B.C. an Athenian was he who fulfilled the conditions laid down in the citizenship law carried by Perikles in 451/0 B.C. The snag is that we are quite insufficiently informed about this law. Aristotle <sup>27</sup>) (evidently excerpting an Atthis, *i.e.* Androtion) gives the contents of the law, or rather the wording of its main regu-  
20 lation, the negative form of which should be observed — μὴ μετέχειν τῆς πόλεως δεῖς ἂν μὴ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ἀστοῖν ἦι γεγονώς, — and he adds (his own supposition as to) the motive which caused Perikles to move the law. This tradition leaves us in doubt about the range of the law and even about the sense of its main regulation; the short section (part of  
25 an enumeration of laws or psephisms carried in the 'fifties which is by no means complete) does not state what regulations (if any) were made by the law, by psephisms, or administratively for carrying it into effect, and this, in view of the turn modern discussion has taken, is particularly regrettable. Whether the law really did not provide orders for putting  
30 it into effect, or whether the gap is the result of Aristotle's abbreviation, the law is so important for the understanding of the events of 445 B.C., that the question requires a somewhat exhaustive treatment, which because of its length I have relegated to an appendix (p. 470 ff.).

It has been assumed either expressly or tacitly but with a rare unanim-  
35 ity that at first nothing happened and that only the accidental donation of corn by a Libyan king provoked a scrutiny of the citizens' lists (a regular διαψηφισμός), followed by numerous law-suits and condemnations <sup>28</sup>). This unanimity can only be explained as the subconscious after-effect which Ph.s figure of παρέγγραφοι had even on those scholars

who expressly rejected it. The figure produced a vague feeling that there must be some truth in the statement and that at the time of the distribution or after it something particular must have happened in 445/4 B.C. Now apart from the doubt as to the value of the figure itself, the prevailing view overlooked the external difficulties. No one asked *when*, in relation to the distribution of corn, the ponderous apparatus of a diapsephismos was put in motion. If it was before the distribution, the corn would presumably have been spoilt before the end of the scrutinies in the demes; if it was after, it would throw a singular light on the mental state of the law-giver who must have known on how many occasions the question of citizenship was vital, for instance on the occasion of sending out cleruchies, not to mention *e.g.* the every day compiling of the lists of jurors. In fact, the considerations necessarily arising from the law and its application extend much further: we should have to consider the entire policy of Perikles in order to be able to judge a separate measure which seems to be a question of principle. To do this would be impossible here (but see p. 477 ff.), and I shall therefore content myself with certain statements which are at least innocuous. It is possible, though by no means certain (actually not even very probable), that the law itself or a psephism following it prescribed a scrutiny of the lists of the demes, or such a scrutiny may have been a consequence of the law some time later. If (I say if) this was the case we have no idea of the fullness of such an examination, the readiness to carry it out, the duration and the results of it. Judging from the analogy of the fourth century it appears probable that the demes (and phratries) contented themselves with effacing the names of those who did not meet the requirements of the new law, *viz.* they probably struck off the lists metics and slaves; it may also be assumed as certain that at least during the next years (new brooms sweep clean) they entered only those children who really had two Athenian parents. It is further conceivable that private intrigue used the *γραφῆ ξενίας* to persecute uncanceled persons and that some of the cancelled appealed against the decision of the demes. Small people probably did not easily appeal, on the other hand charges like these are not often directed against small people; but our lack of knowledge prevents us from seeing clearly about these matters. Anyhow, the law must have given the possibility of taking legal steps. The objection against Koerte's opinion ('presumably soon after the carrying of Perikles' citizen law a board was established which was to conduct the *γραφαὶ ξενίας*, a greater number of which must have been expected') is that one should expect the law itself to have



made regulations. But whether or not it did, it is doubtful whether a new board was created, and if so, whether it was the *ξενοδοίται*<sup>29</sup>). About the number of those affected by the law even so no judgement can be formed. But however our second question is answered, we may assume that, if (it is a big if) the law of 451/0 did prescribe a scrutiny of the lists of the demes, it had already been carried into effect by 445/4 B.C. Consequently, if the distribution of corn led to new denunciations, their number cannot have reached anything like 4760<sup>30</sup>); it cannot have been necessary to order a new scrutiny of the citizen body or to alter the law passed a few years before by giving it retrospective force. In any case, it is quite impossible (to leave no loophole) that the distributing officer applied a notion of citizenship other than that established by the law of 451/0; that e.g. he should on his own initiative have distinguished between those who had only an Athenian father and those who had two Athenian parents, or between citizens according to the status of before 451/0 B.C. and those who conformed to the new law. Any attempt at interpreting the offensive total of 19000 as being that of the claimants with two Athenian parents is frustrated from the start.

(3) Now, what happened in 445/4 B.C.? How did a person prove himself to be an 'Athenian'? Who did the scrutinizing and how was it done? What happened when the distributing officer rejected a claim? If the question under (2) has been answered correctly, at least up to a point, the transaction should be imagined as simple as possible. Of course, the official who conducted the distribution had to examine the title of the claimant to a share, unless the man was personally known to him. As there were no 'identity cards', and as the demes can hardly be supposed to have issued certificates for the one occasion, this was done most easily by the testimony of others (for instance fellow demesmen) whom the official knew. If the claimant could not make out a plausible claim to be a demotes, or if other claimants objected, the official probably sent him home with empty bags. If we try to conceive practically a distribution like this, where mainly small people appeared, we shall have to assume the proceedings to have been rough and ready. It is quite improbable that the official had orders to follow up a case, e.g. to report it to the alleged deme, or even to the board which allegedly according to the new law was concerned with the *γραφὰν ξενίας*. It is, however, quite conceivable that a rejected claimant lodged a complaint or, even more likely, denounced a successful rival. But we shall hardly be inclined to suppose that the number of such denunciations was very high.

To conclude, what do we gain by these considerations for our opinion about the tradition of the events of 445/4 B.C., or (to confine the question to the main point) did the distribution of corn lead to a *διαψηφισμός*? I do not think that anybody will venture to base such an inference on the line of Aristophanes *καὶ ταῦτα μάλιστα Ξενίας φεύγων ἔλαβες κατὰ χοίνικα κριθῶν*. The poet, born about 446 B.C., did not remember those events himself, and he had no reason for enquiring into them more accurately. But he knew of course the citizens' law of 451/0 B.C., and the request of Perikles to legitimate his son by Aspasia was fresh in people's memory, and that case was hardly unique. The most probable assumption, in my opinion, is that Aristophanes in his fancy-picture of how difficult things were made for the people telescoped the years 451/0-445/4 B.C. In regard to Ph. such an assumption is, of course, impossible, for he knew the two dates, that of the law and that of the Egyptian gift. Nor does the Scholiast seem actually to have confused matters: he was concerned primarily with establishing the second date because he had to explain the allusion of the poet to a distribution of corn in the past; he does not really state that a *διαψηφισμός* took place in that year; but he does not state the year of the law either. This may be simply the consequence of the abbreviation of the excerpt from the *Atthis* in our Scholia<sup>31</sup>), but it is not entirely out of the question that Ph. gave his incredible number of almost 5000 *παρέγγραφοι* under the year 445/4 B.C. If such was the case he was under the influence of the comic poet<sup>32</sup>) whom he regarded as a contemporary witness, and he *inferred* from his account a scrutiny of the citizens' list in 445/4 like that which occurred during his own youth in 346/5 B.C.<sup>33</sup>). Not that I think this to be probable, for he did not describe the *διαψηφισμός* until he reached the year 346/5 (F 52). We may conclude that he has not found a tradition about an analogous event in 445/4 B.C. The facts which alone remain (apart from the tradition about the Egyptian gift) are the law of 451/0 B.C., the usage of the demes (and phratries) conforming with its new regulations about determining the quality of citizenship, and perhaps a number of *γραφὰι Ξενίας* brought on the basis of the law during those years<sup>34</sup>). We cannot guess this number, nor do we know how conscientiously the demes obeyed the new regulation in the management of their lists; some of them had a notoriously bad reputation in this respect.

## Appendix

The law of Perikles restricting the franchise is naturally discussed in more or less detail in all accounts of history and of private or constitutional law as a measure of particular importance. But the literature  
 5 (as far as I am acquainted with it) is in my opinion unsatisfactory in this that it deals less (if at all) with the law itself than (1) with the statistic statements as to the alleged first application of it on the occasion of the distribution of corn in 445/4 B.C., and (2) with general considerations about the alleged fatal consequences of the law for the future of  
 10 Athens, considerations which are repeated on the occasion of the renewal of the law in 403/2 B.C.<sup>35</sup>). The discussion of the law itself is tacitly confined to the case of the so-called *μητροδέξιοι*, children from the marriage of an Athenian with a foreign woman, and two questions are raised the second of which is not actually of a legal nature: (1) whether the law  
 15 had retrospective force, and (2) whether it was applied immediately. Both questions are generally answered in the negative: the first on the basis of one or two rather doubtful instances of *μητροδέξιοι* from before 451/0 B.C. who (it is alleged) did not lose their citizenship<sup>36</sup>), the second on the basis of an alleged scrutiny of the citizens' lists on the occasion  
 20 of the distribution of Egyptian corn in 445/4 B.C. Here writers diverge to a certain degree according to the strength of their belief in the traditional number of the *πατέγγραφοι* said to have been then found. Lipsius<sup>37</sup>), who does not dare to reject it definitely, believes it impossible to make the events of 445/4 B.C. agree with Aristotle's dating of the law in  
 25 451/0 unless one assumes that 'the law of Perikles was not given retrospective force until six years after its enactment, on the occasion of that distribution of corn' and that this 'had not been done before from reasons of justice'. Without discussing this alteration in detail (he might  
 30 e.g. have raised the question about the mover, or about the legal form of the new regulation) he simply draws the inference that 'the distribution of corn rendered a scrutiny of the citizens' list necessary', evidently thinking here, too, of 'the *διαψήφισις τῶν δημοτῶν*'; when 'a vote of the demotai on each person entered in the citizens' registers kept by the demes decided whether or not the entry was justified'. Gomme (*Essays* p. 80 n. 2;  
 35 85; 88), who declares the number of the *πατέγγραφοι* handed down to be 'quite unreliable', rejects the idea of retrospective force both for the law of 451/0 B.C. and for a psephism which he assumes and which 'ordered a scrutiny in every deme in 445'. The consequences of this 'diapsephisis' however, were not, as would be supposed, appeals of those who had been

struck off the lists; 'the only law-suits in 445/4 were *γραφαι ξενίας*, held before the *xenodikai*, a special board probably instituted for this occasion'. This suggestion seems to contradict his preceding detailed treatment of the law (or psephism) of Demophilos in 346/5 B.C. <sup>38</sup>).

5 In the latter case Gomme makes a sharp and correct distinction between *ἐφέσεις ἐκ δημοτῶν* (the natural consequence of a *διαψήφισις* in the deme, whether general or special, where in fact the deme is the defendant) and the *γραφὴ ξενίας* which any citizen may raise at any time and in which the alleged *παρέγγραφος* is the person accused. This contradiction is the

10 consequence of the semi-obscurity in which the law of 451/0 is kept <sup>39</sup>). No matter whether we are dealing with a *γραφὴ ξενίας* before the *ξενοδικαι*, or with the *ἐφείσεις ἐκ δημοτῶν* as the result of a *διαψήφισις* before whatever court of law it may have been; and more than that, whether we concern ourselves with the result of the *διαψήφισις* or with the action

15 itself; the true question is: on what principles did the *demotai* vote or did the law-courts decide in 451/0 B.C. (or for that matter in 445/4)? This evidently means: what were the regulations of the law of 451/0 B.C. about citizenship, or, if we believe that Aristotle gives the exact and complete wording of the regulation, what does it signify? To state the problem

20 quite crudely: the *ναυτοδίκαι*, before whom (according to the psephism preserved by Krateros 342 F 4) anybody could prosecute anybody on the charge *ξενίας*, knew exactly what they had to decide. The *demotai*, or whatever board, who according to the psephism of Perikles (*μὴ μετέχειν τῆς πόλεως ὅς ἂν μὴ ἐξ ἀφοῦν ἄστοιῶν ἦι γεγονώς*) had to decide whether

25 or not A or B was a citizen, were not in that happy position. The question of the retrospective force of the law was not the only one to be raised, there was a whole bundle of questions, and we had best first state the conceivable questions methodically and seemingly theoretically even if (because of the state of our tradition) it is manifest beforehand that any

30 answer can afford us no more than a probability, and that the true answer must be looked for in another direction than in those which have been tried usually until now.

The first question is this: was the law of 451/0 B.C. a regulation concerning the future, as Ed. Meyer supposes? <sup>40</sup>). To put it practically, did

35 it prescribe to the demes (and phratries) how they were to proceed when entering in their lists the male (and female) children born after 451/0 B.C.? Or (and this seems to be the prevailing opinion <sup>41</sup>)) did the law establish for the present time who among those whose names stood in the lists of members of the demes (and phratries) in 451/0 B.C., really had a claim

to citizenship? If we start from the wording of Aristotle (as we obviously must) we cannot seriously doubt that only the second interpretation can be admitted: the negative formulation in ch. 26, 3 *μη μετέχειν τῆς πόλεως* (as compared with *μετέχουσι τῆς πολιτείας* in the systematic part ch. 42, 1) and the absence of any limitation or other qualification<sup>42</sup>) recommend this interpretation. Aristotle (Androtion) and Ph. understood it thus; this is shown for the former by the reason he gives (*διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πολιτῶν*), for the latter by his statement that nearly 5000 *παρέγγραφοι* were found, who cannot possibly have been entered in defiance of the new law between 451/0 and 445/4 B.C. I wish to state expressly that it is another question whether the interpretation of the Atthidographers was correct, *i.e.* founded on a full text of the law which precluded any doubts, or whether they interpreted a text containing nothing but what Aristotle gives according to the regulations valid at their time and according to the psephism of Demophilos ordering *γενέσθαι ζήτησιν πάντων τῶν ἐγγεγραμμένων τοῖς ληξιαρχικοῖς γραμματεῖοις εἴτε γνήσιοι πολῖται εἰσιν εἴτε μή, τοὺς δὲ μὴ γεγονότας ἐξ ἀστοῦ καὶ ἐξ ἀστῆς ἐξαλείφεισθαι· διαψηφίζεσθαι δὲ περὶ πάντων τῶν δημοτῶν ἐξαληλίφθαι καὶ εἶναι μετοίκους, τοῖς δὲ βουλομένοις ἔφρασι ψήφωι τῶν δημοτῶν ἐξαληλίφθαι καὶ εἶναι μετοίκους, τοῖς δὲ βουλομένοις ἔφρασι εἰς τοὺς δικαστὰς δεδῶσθαι κτλ.*<sup>43</sup>). But judging from the interpretation of the law of 451/0 by the Atthidographers, we can definitely maintain that it did not contain a proviso like that in the psephism of 403/2 *μηδένα τῶν μετ' Εὐκλείδην ἄρχοντα μετέχειν τῆς πόλεως, ἂν μὴ ἄμφω τοὺς γονεῶς ἀστοὺς ἐπιδείξεται, τοὺς δὲ πρὸ Εὐκλείδου ἀνεξετάστους ἀφεῖσθαι*<sup>44</sup>).

25. The second question is: was the law of 451/0 B.C. directed solely, or at least in the first line, against the *μητρόξενοι* who are alone discussed by modern authors<sup>45</sup>? We may suppose so, but then we should have to make the same supposition concerning the law of 403/2 B.C. and its rider in particular; not so much because in one version *δς ἂν μὴ ἐξ ἀστῆς* is said<sup>46</sup>) instead of the evidently documentary *ἐξ ἀμποῦν ἀστοῦν*, but because it is quite incredible that an Athenian legislator should ever have treated children of non-Athenian fathers as being on the same level with *μητρόξενοι*. The presupposition, conscious or subconscious, but self-evident in any case, for all regulations of this kind both for the law of 403/2 and the psephism preserved by Krateros is the citizenship of the father<sup>47</sup>).

35. The assumption is almost as self-evident as the fact that metics and slaves are not mentioned, in regard to whom the *μετέχειν τῆς πολιτείας* is anyhow out of the question. Nikomenes, in 403/2 B.C., evidently proposed his motion in order to preclude a *διαψηφισμός*, or a recourse

to the law of 451/0, which had probably never been abolished; but the words τούς δὲ πρὸς Εὐκλείδου ἀνεξετάστους ἀφεῖναι (if they belong to his text) do certainly not mean that proceedings in the ordinary way against ξένοι, μέτοικοι, and slaves were precluded. How this was done 5 is another question, which does not concern us here; but, in my opinion, no doubt is left about the feelings of the Athenians in these matters by the events of the year 401/0 B.C. <sup>48</sup>): Ἀρχῖνος γραψάμενος τὸ ψήφισμα τὸ Θρασυβούλου παρανόμων, ἐν ᾧ μετεδίδου τῆς πολιτείας πᾶσι τοῖς ἐκ Πειραιέως συνακατελοῦσι, ὧν ἔτι φανερώς ἦσαν δοῦλοι (Aristot. Ἀθπ. 40. 2).

10 If the law was meant for the present time, and if it was not qualified in any way (which we have no reason to assume, or, more cautiously, no trace of a qualification is preserved in our tradition; on the contrary, the number of παρέγγραφοι which has come down to us must be regarded as evidence to the contrary by all those who in any degree believe 15 in it): was it provided with retrospective force, or was it meant thus, or could it have been interpreted thus, particulars wanting? This question is the most important one for the understanding of the law, and at the same time the most difficult to answer, because we must first state what 'retrospective' means. It is true that the question manifestly lacks sense 20 when put in this general form. As we are dealing with a first law of this kind, and as incidentally the concept of citizenship (μετέχειν τῆς πόλεως) was established for the first time <sup>49</sup>), an unqualified retrospective force is inconceivable. Even the German legislation of 1933 A.D., in defining its fundamental concept, went back no further than the grand- 25 parents (on both sides), or where special purity of race was required, to a certain year (1800 A.D. I think it was). Aristotle *Polit.* 3, 1, 9 clearly perceived the problem involved: ὀρίζονται δὲ πρὸς τὴν χρῆσιν πολίτην τὸν ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων πολιτῶν καὶ μὴ θατέρου μόνον, οἷον πατρός ἢ μητρός, οἱ δὲ καὶ τοῦτ' ἐπὶ πλεόν ζητοῦσιν, οἷον ἐπὶ πάππους δύο ἢ τρεῖς ἢ πλεί- 30 ους· οὕτω δὲ ὀριζομένων πολιτικῶς καὶ ταχέως, ἀποροῦσι τινες τὸν τρίτον ἐκεῖνον ἢ τέταρτον πῶς ἔσται πολίτης. Did the law of 451/0 B.C. define its fundamental conception of ἀστός in some way <sup>50</sup>)? In this context it may seem remarkable that Aristotle disposes of the first question by a witticism of Gorgias—it did, in fact, not allow of a solution; but he at once 35 joins to it a specific point taken from the history of Athens which he treats seriously: ἀλλ' ἴσως ἐκεῖνο μᾶλλον ἔχει ἀπορίαν, ὅσοι μετέσχον μεταβολῆς γενομένης πολιτείας, οἷον Ἀθήνησιν ἐποίησε Κλεισθένης μετὰ τὴν τῶν τυράννων ἐκβολήν· πολλοὺς γὰρ ἐφυλέτευσε ξένους καὶ δούλους [μετοίκους]. We need not investigate here how the events of the years 510-508 B.C.

influenced the setting up of what were the first citizens' lists <sup>51</sup>), or ask if there is any historical truth behind the words *μετὰ τὴν τῶν τυράννων κατά-  
 λυσιν ἐποίησαν διαψηφισμόν, ὡς πολλῶν κοινωνούντων τῆς πολιτείας οὐ προσήκον*  
 of 'Ath. 13, 5 on the one hand, and on the other hand of the reasons  
 5 given for the reform of the phylai *ibid.* 21, 2 *ἀναμεῖξαι βουλόμενος, ὅπως*  
*μετάσχωσι πλείους τῆς πολιτείας* <sup>52</sup>). For the decisive fact is beyond doubt  
 that the distribution of all citizens or of the whole population among the  
 newly created demes, the resulting necessity of setting up registers in  
 the demes, and regulations about the official form of the citizens' names <sup>53</sup>),  
 10 signified an entirely new beginning: citizenship is put on a new basis  
 and for the first time in such a manner (factually, not by a law) that the  
 individual's quality of being a citizen can at any time be established  
 easily and according to objective points of view. I have no doubt that  
 Aristotle did not choose his example either at random or on purely  
 15 theoretical grounds, but that the proceedings of Kleisthenes became the  
 foundation of whatever measures affecting the citizens' lists were taken.  
 Certainly it is not an accident that, on the occasion of the first attempt  
 at reforming the constitution in the conservative sense in 413/2 B.C.,  
 a motion prescribed to look up, among others, the *πάτριοι νόμοι οὓς Κλει-  
 20 σθένης ἐθήκεν* κτλ. ('Ath. 29, 3), or that we hear at that time the echo  
 of a public discussion about the formation of the citizens' list <sup>54</sup>). Also  
 we know how strongly Aristotle stood under the influence of the political  
 pamphlets which accompanied the repeated attempts at restoring the  
*πάτριος πολιτεία*. Of the discussions in public and in the Assembly about  
 25 the Citizenship Law of Perikles in 451/0 B.C. no echo has come down to  
 us, although we must expect that there was opposition. It is inconceivable  
 that the conservative party, formed by Thukydidēs son of Melesias  
 during the exile of Kimon <sup>55</sup>), kept silent in view of a law the wording  
 of which in the form handed down to us threatened the absent head and  
 30 the deputy leader of the party with loss of citizenship. The implications  
 of the regulation *μη̄ ἐξ ἀμοφοῖν ἀστοῖν γεγωνῶς* must have been manifest  
 to everybody: the ancient family comprehends three or (in some cases)  
 four generations; it goes back to the *πάππους δύο ἢ τρεῖς* (this is shown  
 both by the *Τριτοπατρεῖς* worshipped in cult and by the laws in which the  
 35 *ἀγχιστεία* plays a part); and a reaching back of that kind implied that  
 a man had to prove, should occasion arise, that his grandfather (or  
 greatgrandfather) had been entered in the first list of his deme, no  
 matter whether the proceeding was required by the law or became  
 necessary in consequence of a law-suit conducted on the basis of the law.

The analogous proof had accordingly (*i.e.* by the entries of her father and grandfather) to be conducted in regard to the mother whose name was not registered in the deme-lists, if necessary with the help of the lists of the phratries. Now, we can maintain with a fair degree of certainty 5 that the direct demand for such a proof was not contained in the law: Aristotle would not have omitted a regulation that the parents must be ἀστοὶ ἐπὶ δύο (ἢ τρεῖς) πάππους even in the most succinct excerpt from the *Atthis* which he used. On the other hand we know for certain that the law did not contain a clause which would have prevented this 10 going back to the third (fourth) generation in a case when an examination was found necessary <sup>56</sup>). If the opposition did bring a motion of that kind it was defeated.

It seems a complete deadlock: our evidence demands the application of the law to the lists of citizens as they were in 451/0. On the other hand 15 we do not know whether the law gave any regulations for the purpose of its being carried into effect, or whether it contented itself with establishing the new concept of citizen, leaving it to the discretion of the demes to make their arrangements accordingly; it may even have expected private persons to bring γραφαὶ ξενίας on the strength of the new 20 definition, not merely against metics and slaves who were entered into the lists, but also against persons whose citizenship was not in conformity with the new regulations because they had a non-Athenian mother. Again we may maintain with a fair degree of certainty that the law did not expressly preclude a complete scrutiny of the citizens' lists in the 25 demes, but that it did not expressly order it either. It is not probable that a διαψηφισμὸς took place either in 451/0 or in 445/4 B.C. <sup>57</sup>), but γραφαὶ ξενίας were always possible, and if we may trust the evidence of Aristophanes they were brought in 445/4 B.C., and perhaps in the preceding years too, in a number which we cannot define but which was hard- 30 ly very high <sup>58</sup>). If charges were brought it was doubtless on the basis of Perikles' law. We may suppose that the law anticipated the possibility of such charges, and that it prescribed at least the legal steps to be taken when it was appealed to. The regulations may have been as succinct as they are in the psephism preserved by Krateros <sup>59</sup>); Aristotle had no 35 reason for copying them. There is nothing to make this supposition *a priori* impossible; but it clearly means that the object of the legislator was not (or at least not at the moment and not primarily) to purge the citizens' lists of undesirable elements, but to establish his new concept of a citizen. But as this concept was not embodied in a clear rule (for



instance by an addition of some kind or by a key-date) we apparently find ourselves in a vicious circle, for we come back to the problem how the law-courts were to decide the question whether or not *e.g.* Kimon (if a *γραφῆ* *Ξενίας* was brought against him) was a citizen according to this law. Still, just these 'ifs' carry us a step further: perhaps we may say now that if, in fact, there was a gap or a vagueness in the law this can only have been left intentionally <sup>60</sup>).

Now that the question about the contents of the law seems to have been answered to a certain extent, the next question becomes all the more urgent: what was the purpose of Perikles when he brought in a law of just this formulation in just this year? In my opinion, we see this question about the motive in another light at once when we draw the inferences from the perception that the number of almost 5000 *πατέγγραφοι* not only is without any guarantee whatever, but is absurdly exaggerated <sup>61</sup>). The account of E. M. Walker <sup>62</sup>), the factual correctness of which I also doubt in some respects, certainly draws a picture far too gloomy. The extent to which the citizens' lists were permeated at that time by unqualified elements seems to me to be in general overestimated greatly. I think that a law of that kind, which did not at the same time order a general *διαψηφισμός*, could only have been issued if the number of those perhaps wrongly entered was inconsiderable in comparison with the estimated number of citizens, and if conditions were not so scandalous as to call for a severe remedy. After the institution of *Ξενοδίκαι* on the occasion of the law of 451/0 B.C. has become more than doubtful again <sup>25</sup> (see n. 29) we are to-day not even in a position to state that on the basis of it 'a considerable number of *γραφαὶ Ξενίας* was expected'. In view of our poor tradition we cannot attach great importance to the fact that we are not informed of any such lawsuits, not even when Comedy invented an alien mother for almost every well-known politician. We must, <sup>30</sup> however, pay some attention to this point, too, if the law was primarily aimed at the *μητροξένοι*, as is generally and probably correctly, assumed. If the inferences we have drawn are correct, *i.e.* if the law was not passed in order to put an end to scandalous conditions actually existing, and if at the same time it was capable of immediate application in case of need, <sup>35</sup> there still remains the possibility that, having cause to apprehend that such conditions would arise, the government tried to prevent this beforehand. But that kind of foresight was not exactly frequent in ancient any more than it is in modern times, nor do modern writers assume it when declaring that it was an accident that 'in 445/4 an occasion arose for

applying the law strictly', or even the necessity for altering it by giving it 'retrospective force'. Such an accident could really not have been anticipated in 451/0 B.C. That event is therefore not suitable for furnishing the motive which induced Perikles to bring in the law. If he had any motives (and we cannot doubt that he had) they must have been founded deeper, *i.e.* in the general character of his policy and its aims. This question must be gone into seriously. But first it seems necessary to put another question: were political conditions in 451/0 B.C. such as to make it appear desirable to Perikles to get by this law a weapon into his hands against certain opponents of his policy, a weapon capable of being used at any time by bringing a γραφή ξενίας, but which (the law not precisely ordering a scrutiny of the citizens' lists) need only be used in case of necessity? Did Perikles propose the law just at that time because he definitely had certain persons in his mind<sup>63</sup>? The answer to this question can hardly be doubtful. Of course, the law was applicable against metics and slaves who had found their way into the list of a deme, but it would not have been necessary for that purpose, the law mentioned by Krateros being available for these cases. The wording of Perikles' law corroborates the prevailing opinion that it was mainly (if not only) aimed at the sons of an Athenian by an alien mother. These μητροξενοί were found, by no means only but presumably in a comparatively large number, in the ruling classes, and we know of many who had played particularly important parts in the government of the State: Hippias and Hipparchos, Kleisthenes and Themistokles had been μητροξενοί, and Kimon, who in 451/0 B.C. returned from his exile, was a μητροξενός. This does not look like a mere coincidence. We cannot very well doubt that after the breakdown of the Egyptian enterprise (which had only one consequence not undesirable for the government of Athens at the time, *viz.* the transferring of the federal treasure to Athens) and after ten years of the First Peloponnesian War, Perikles prepared in his mind the great change in foreign policy, and in doing so foresaw the necessity of settling with the conservative party. In fact, the conflict broke out in full strength very soon after the death of Kimon in 450/49 B.C. and the conclusion of the peace of Kallias in 449 B.C., and it was only ended for the moment with the ostracism of Thukydidēs, son of Melesias, in spring 443 B.C.<sup>64</sup>. Perikles first had to give rope to Kimon and the conservative programme which, in spite of the experience of 463/2 B.C. (F 117), aimed at peace with Sparta and the resumption of war with Persia. He may have been quite willing to do so considering that a success of the Athenian arms

would make Persia ready for peace, whereas a new failure would finally prove the wrongness of the conservative foreign policy. The unexpected but convenient death of Kimon saved Perikles from the necessity of using the weapon forged against him, but the law which he may have formulated vaguely on purpose must have hung over Kimon like a sword of Damokles, for Perikles could at any time have made one of his colleagues bring a γραφή ξενίας, and the trial in itself (particularly after a failure in battle) would have been sufficient to paralyse Kimon permanently. Against Thukydides, who merely (to speak in the terms of German racial legislation) had a 'half-Aryan wife' or 'one Jewish grandmother', and that on the distaff side (according to whether he was the son-in-law or, which is more probable, the brother-in-law of Kimon) the success of a charge ξενίας would perhaps have been doubtful, and Perikles apparently did not even make an attempt at legal prosecution; here the old measure of ostracism succeeded.

In the discussions of the law made hitherto the name of Kimon has played a part only in so far as he, or his sons, were said to furnish the proof that the law of 451/0 B.C. was not provided with retrospective force <sup>66</sup>). These discussions keep entirely to the sphere of general considerations, and in the answers two tendencies can be distinguished: a materialistic and an idealistic conception of the measure. The former, which is by far the prevailing one, puts the law to the account of 'radical democracy' and of the egotism of 'the demos', which wanted to enjoy alone all the benefits of the Empire, and whose claims Perikles was obliged to fulfil 'when he set about to turn to a policy of peace and had to prepare for the assaults of his opponents'. Thus Ed. Meyer, for whom the law is 'drastic evidence' of his view that 'even at that time Perikles as the head of the party by far outweighed Perikles the statesman' <sup>66</sup>). For this conception of Ed. Meyer is combined with a severe condemnation of the law which was passed 'in a time when the heavy losses of the war should much rather have dictated measures to increase the number of citizens'. The writers who hold that view find a pleasure in describing in detail the gloomy consequences this law had for the fate of Athens <sup>67</sup>). The idealistic conception, which regards (or ought to regard; for they are not very clear about the actual difference) Perikles as the spiritual author of the law, regards it as a justified, even necessary, measure against the loosening of the old discipline and manner of life, because the marriages with aliens, hitherto not expressly forbidden, 'began to be a serious threat to patriotic feeling' <sup>68</sup>), or (to state it in the more sober terms of

Gomme): 'there had been in practice, inevitably, some intermarriage (how much at Athens we do not know—certainly chiefly among the Few); but the law of 451 was an attempt to restore what was regarded as normal by the Many; it was in accordance with average sentiment'.

5 It does not seem difficult to criticize and possibly even to refute the assumptions and the arguments (as far as the term is appropriate, for generally we have to do with mere assertions) of both conceptions in their details <sup>69</sup>). But a criticism of the details would hardly be profitable, particularly because it would have to remain purely in the negative.

10 The individual measure can be judged and interpreted positively only in the light of the whole personality of Perikles and of his policy as a whole, his aims and the conditions under which he was in a position to carry them into effect during the two distinct periods of his activity as a statesman. We should have to take into account the manifest resist-

15 ance of the opposition and the less manifest obstructions by the demands and attitudes of mind of his own followers. As that is impossible here, I can only state my opinion *ex cathedra*; but I think the occasion to be of sufficient importance to do so <sup>70</sup>). The question to be put quite concretely is why Perikles in 451/0 B.C. passed a law without taking measures at

20 the same time for making it effectual at once. The immediate answer to this question is given by the suggestion that the law created a weapon against the leader of the opposite party when he returned from his ten years' exile; a weapon capable of being used when the conservatives either demanded a change in foreign policy on principle, or set themselves up

25 against such a change. The further question is whether this answer is sufficient. The suggested motive would not preclude that Perikles at the same time met halfway a request (thus the general opinion) or a widely spread sentiment of the people (Gomme) by such a law. In other words: did he want to buy the unconditional adherence of the masses by a

30 measure the popularity of which he could anticipate, and by a concession which did not seem vital to him? Or did he think that the possible consequences of a more extensive application of the law might in some way be desirable from his own point of view? Again in other words: is the fundamental principle of the law an emanation of Perikles' own mind?

35 Does it fit organically into the whole trend of his policy because he found it suitable for the promotion of his aims? We may assume that Perikles considered all possible implications; otherwise it is clear that this question cannot be answered with full certainty because the answer depends on our general conception of the statesman Perikles, which in view of the

nature of our sources is after all preconceived and in any case not really demonstrable. In my opinion, the first alternative is highly improbable if not impossible. I am quite satisfied that a measure of this kind did not (and never could) originate in the popular mind, which does not produce ideas but takes them, either willingly and easily, or under more or less stress of propaganda from its leaders. I think that the law *was* thus imposed on the people, and I find a sort of proof of this opinion in the fact that the law was not put into practice immediately, systematically, and completely. This would make no sense if there existed in the 'fifties a *vox populi* demanding restriction of civil rights for the sons of mixed marriages. It would not help if some years later a special occasion (which nobody could foresee in 451/0 B.C.) gave rise to a violent outbreak of a sort of 'Trade Union spirit'. Still, we ought not to conclude that the law was caused by popular feeling, but that popular feeling was evoked by the law, or (the most I should admit) strengthened or made conscious of itself. The other alternative, however, I should be prepared to affirm unhesitatingly. Even if the law were created not only for the purpose of the moment and the possibility of applying it against a certain political opponent (as it were a νόμος ἐπ' ἀνδρῶν), but in deference to popular feeling as well (and even a great statesman must consider this) it would be fully comprehensible out of the convictions and the aims which determined Perikles' leadership. It is (and we are strongly reminded of Kleisthenes and perhaps even of Themistokles) the almost necessary logical consequence of his conception of the part of the Demos in the State and of the position of the State in Hellas. His leadership, seen from within, stands under the uniform influence of his democratic idealism or doctrinairism (whichever you like, and surely Perikles had in him more than a tinge of the doctrinaire), and in foreign policy it is ruled by his programme of hegemony in Hellas to which he kept immovably <sup>71</sup>). In order to attain this aim he wanted to make the Athenians the 'herrenvolk': the speeches in Thukydides are proof incontrovertible not only that he knew that this was his aim, but that he thought it necessary as well <sup>72</sup>). I am not concerned here about the morals of the case, I simply state the facts which do not leave us in doubt about the ultimate aim of Perikles— the destruction of aristocratic Sparta and of the idea of dualism by a democratic and hegemonic Athens. The considered judgement of Thukydides was that this aim was obtainable—most modern historians agree and are sympathetic, with a proviso that (to put it crudely) it would have been a good thing for Greece, if only Perikles had been a democrat all

round, not in Athens alone. I am not satisfied, as they seem to be, that it would have been possible for Perikles to divide his undividable aim, to follow a democratic policy in Athens and a League of Nations policy in Greece. It is easy to say that the policy of Perikles in the crucial period, 5 after the treasure of the League had been transferred to Athens, the provinces established, the peace with Persia concluded, is responsible for the secession of Samos and later on of Lesbos. But the argument loses its force when we think of the revolts during the first period of the League, when there was a conservative government in Athens with 10 Kimon at its head, of the party strife, and of the Persian quislings in the Ionian towns and not only in Ionia. I do not know whether Perikles' ideas ranged so wide that he considered a unity of trade, commerce and coinage as the first step towards a genuine internal union of Greece; the parallel with the hopes of the creators of the 'Norddeutsche Zollverein' 15 offers itself, but I am afraid that the modern critics of the policy of Perikles have been too much under the anachronistic influence of parallels of this kind and modern ideas altogether. I am convinced that Perikles saw no way towards the union of Greece, desirable in any case, but that of Athenian hegemony, because the material and intellectual structure 20 of the fifth century Greek *polis* (and for the matter of that the Greek *polis* of any time) was not ready for any other form of union, for instance for the idea of 'citizenship of the Empire'. Possibly the structure of the *polis* was not capable of a union of that kind; we may suitably compare the sentiments of the sovereign states of to-day towards the League 25 of Nations, which would necessarily deprive them of part of their sovereignty if it were to become a real union, not a more or less loose federation. However that may be, the political aim of Perikles was dictated by a firm political conviction which we have to respect even if we do not approve of it, and I do not believe that our knowledge of the prevailing 30 conditions and of the possibilities open to Perikles is such as to enable us to sit in judgement over him and over Thukydides. Perhaps the policy of Perikles was wrong because his political conviction was wrong, and his outlook (or the outlook of his people) was too narrow and lacked imagination. But I am inclined to give him at least the benefit of the doubt.

35 (120) The drastic abridgment of the scholion has caused much confusion in its details. As it is, it consists of three sections set off against each other by ἄλλως, and all three refer the lines of Aristophanes to Thukydides son of Melesias. (1) The first section, starting from φεύγων, discusses the term φυγή, as shown by the quotation of Idomeneus (338 F 1),

which does not refer to Thukydides but to Themistokles and subordinates the special term *δοτρακισμός*<sup>1</sup>) to the general *φυγή* (*εἶδος γὰρ τι φυγῆς ἐστὶν ὁ δοτρακισμός*), thus bringing in the Thukydides who was ostracised, not banished. (2) The second section enumerates four homonymous *Θουκυδίδαι*. The heading *τέσσαρες δὲ εἰσι Θουκυδίδαι Ἀθηναῖοι* is wrong or inaccurate, for the third in the series is a Thessalian; on the other hand, the Athenian poet from the deme Acherdus, mentioned by Androtion and belonging approximately to this time<sup>2</sup>), is lacking. (3) The third and most important section unfortunately is the most mutilated. But we do perceive this: it alone raises the question, which is the same as in another passage of the *Vespae* (F 119), *viz.* to what historical event or person the poet alludes. It answers it in the same manner as in that fragment by a conjecture (*μῆποτε*), evidence for which is given from the Attidographers. It further rejects other conjectures, particularly the reference to the historian Thukydides. It is possible that a fourth section began with *ὁ γενόμενος δοτρακισμός*, for the form of the sentence is not causative; but it is more probable that in the third (as in the second) section the political opponent of Perikles was dealt with somewhat more fully as being the man whom Aristophanes had in view. His person had become doubtful by an error (?) of Theopompos<sup>3</sup>), and the scholion adduces evidence in support of the thesis that by *ἀντιπολιτευσάμενος Περικλεῖ* only the son of Melesias could be meant.

We proceed differently: the learned discussion about ostracism is not relevant for deciding the question as to who is meant; it merely led the Scholiasts to wrong conclusions, or to conclusions wrongly supported, and eventually to a wrong arrangement of the facts<sup>4</sup>). As to the question whether *φεύγειν* can denote ostracism, the context, *viz.* the comparison with the dog brought to court on the charge of theft (*καὶ μὴν ὁ φεύγων οὔτοσι Λάβης πάρα*) leaves no doubt<sup>5</sup>) of the meaning 'Thukydides when on trial'. This leaves us the choice between the historian, who was condemned *προδοσίας* in winter 424/3 B.C.<sup>6</sup>), and the Thukydides *Ach.* 707 ff. who cannot be the historian<sup>7</sup>). But in the trial, which evidently took place not long before the performance of the play (Lenaea 425 B.C.), the defendant is an old man with whom the young orators deal according to their pleasure, while the historian was at that time in his thirties at the utmost; and as it is improbable that the two passages, which are obviously related to each other, should refer to different persons this tells against referring the lines of the *Wasps* to the historian. It is further improbable that the unlucky general should have returned to Athens

in 424/3 B.C. merely to stand his trial, about the issue of which he could not be in doubt. Lastly and definitely *ποτέ* can only have been used if the trial occurred some years before <sup>8</sup>). I suppose nobody doubts to-day that in the *Acharnians* the son of Melesias is meant, who at the time <sup>5</sup> was about 75 years old; the wrestling metaphors are decisive <sup>9</sup>). Aristophanes put the trial, which created a sensation just because of the person accused (whether or not it had a political background) under a general and moving aspect <sup>10</sup>); it is natural that he remembered it a couple of years later, and the painful detail fits exactly into the general <sup>10</sup> picture <sup>11</sup>). There can be no serious doubt as to the matter; but we may raise the question whether the Scholiast, who resolutely referred both passages to the son of Melesias, inferred the reference from the same considerations, or whether he had at his disposal a special tradition about the trial. Both questions must be answered in the negative: the former <sup>15</sup> because in that case the juggling with the interpretation of *φεύγειν*, on which alone the reference of the passage in the *Wasps* is evidently founded (*ὁ γενόμενος ὀστρακισμὸς ἐμφαίνει τὸν Μελησίου καὶ τὸν ὀστρακισθέντα*), would have been superfluous, the latter because Schol. *Ach.* 703 ff. give nothing beyond Schol. *Vesp.* 947 (they have copied it). Consequently the <sup>20</sup> Scholiasts found nothing about the trial in Androtion and Ph. It is possible, of course, that they mentioned the return of Thukydidēs in 433 B.C. and reported the resumption of his opposition to Perikles (if he did resume it <sup>12</sup>)). But Didymos cited them merely because he referred Aristophanes' allusions to the 'ostracised' Thukydidēs, not to the historian or any <sup>25</sup> other bearer of the name; and he quoted the Atthidographers in order to prove that the political opponent of Perikles was the son of Melesias, a fact which nobody doubts to-day <sup>13</sup>). As to the trial, he probably thought of the political struggles of the years 449 (or earlier) to 443 B.C. on account of *ποτέ* (as in F 119 he quoted Ph. for events of 445/4 B.C.). <sup>30</sup> Whether he referred *φεύγων* to the ostracism remains an open question, though it is not probable that he did; nor do we know whether he said more about the ostracism. This is regrettable because both Androtion and Ph. must have treated it fully, and Didymos usually gave rather copious excerpts. As it is, we cannot compare the two *Atthides* either <sup>35</sup> with each other or with the anonymous *Vit. Thuc.* 6-7 and Plutarch *Perikl.* 11. There hardly have been serious discrepancies as to the matter <sup>14</sup>); and neither Atthidographer had any reason for even citing Aristophanes.

(121) In this case, too, we shall do well first to analyze the scholion



which is less difficult than with F 120<sup>1</sup>). Like that fragment F 121 is merely an excerpt, but it is a clear and sensible one which we have only to read without prejudice in order to find and correct the corruptions in the names of the archons. The Scholiast discusses the antecedents of the Peloponnesian War as Aristophanes gave them in 422/1 B.C. in *Peace* vv. 603-618, or rather the point in which this account differs from that which he had given five years earlier (426/5 B.C.) in the *Acharnians* 514 ff. In both plays the war breaks out over the Megarian psephism. That this was not only the general assumption, but must have corresponded with the actual events, is nowhere clearer than in the record of Thukydides, which is meant to refute the assumption that the psephism was the *cause* of the war<sup>2</sup>). But whereas Dikaiopolis in the *Acharnians*, parodying Herodotos, gives as the reason for the decree mutual captures of some wanton women<sup>3</sup>), god Hermes in *Peace* knows a deeper motive, the unfortunate affair of Pheidias: εἶτα Περικλέης φοβηθείς μὴ μετάσχοι τῆς τύχης . . . πρὶν παθεῖν τι δεινὸν αὐτός, ἐξέφλεξε τὴν πόλιν · ἐμβαλὼν σπινθήρα μικρὸν Μεγαρικῷ ψηφίσματος ἐξεφύσησεν τοσοῦτον πόλεμον ὥστε τῷ πάντι πάντας Ἕλληνας δακρυῦσαι. The interpreter has looked up both the case of Pheidias and the Megarian psephisma in Ph. and found the events under different archons, who, in the Mss., are called Πυθόδωρος and Σκυθόδωρος. Since he expressly states that Skythodoros was ἐβδομος ἀπὸ τούτου it does not matter that he (or an abbreviator) compressed the two excerpts into one sentence by grammatically subordinating the second (ἐπὶ Σκυθοδώρου περὶ Μεγαρέων εἰπών). The first quotation (ἐπὶ Πυθοδώρου ἄρχοντος ταῦτά φησι) seems to be verbatim; in any case, it is a typical chronographic entry which in short sentences, connected with each other by καὶ in the usual manner, notes down the several events of one year<sup>4</sup>). Of these the interpreter has picked out only what was of interest to him: the dedication of the Parthenos (καὶ τὸ ἄγαλμα . . . ἐστάθη — Φειδίου δὲ ποιήσαντος; consequently this was not the first entry of that year); the proceedings taken against the artist (καὶ Φειδίας ὁ ποιήσας — ἐκρίθη); his flight from Athens and the further vicissitudes of his life (καὶ Φειδίεος ὁ ποιήσας — ἀποθανεῖν ὑπὸ Ἡλείων), this third section being distinctly set off from the documentary information by λέγεται<sup>5</sup>). The second quotation, headed ἐπὶ Σκυθοδώρου . . . περὶ Μεγαρέων εἰπών, records succinctly (although with one detail not found in Thukydides I, 67, 4<sup>6</sup>)) the quarrel with Megara, viz. the complaint of the Megarians in Sparta and (going back with γὰρ<sup>7</sup>) the psephism which was the object of their complaint. On the basis of the archons' dates (i.e. the chrono-

logical evidence) the interpreter (not Ph. <sup>8</sup>) contradicts the account of τινές who, like the poet, connected the case of Pheidias with the Megarian psephism by making the former the cause of Perikles' moving the psephism. This is the well-known account of Ephoros <sup>9</sup>) for the correct  
 5 valuation of which one point must be considered: Ephoros did not provide absolute dates so that the great interval of seven years which the Scholiast found, when looking up his *Atthis*, was not conspicuous in his record; the reasons leading to the war were according to him the result of a development of uncertain duration. This is the reason why the  
 10 Scholiast declares the imputation against Perikles, implied by Ephoros' report (and by the poet), to be absurd (ἄλογος): according to Ph. the artist was exiled seven years before and died in exile. It cannot be denied that the proof is clear and complete in itself. It is annoying that the names of the archons are corrupt in both excerpts, but not more than  
 15 just annoying, as the interval between the two archons is preserved in the first excerpt: the alterations made already by Lepaulmier <sup>10</sup>) (Πυθοδώρου to Θεοδώρου, and Σκυθοδώρου to Πυθοδώρου) are slight and certain <sup>11</sup>). It is really of no importance for the matter whether the blame for the corruptions falls on the scribes, or whether Didymos 'had before  
 20 him a corrupt archons' list in which the archon of 432/1 was called Σκυθόδωρος and the archon of 438/7 Πυθόδωρος' <sup>12</sup>). What is essential for the matter is the interval: Ph. entered the charge against Pheidias under the archon of the seventh year before the complaint of the Megarians in the Spartan diet; consequently, since for the latter the year 432/1 B.C.  
 25 is certain, and since in datings of the form ἐβδομος ἀπὸ (πρὸ) τοῦ δεῖνα always both years are counted, the case of Pheidias' accusation in Athens belongs in 438/7. That this year was actually mentioned in the ancient chronological tables is confirmed by Eusebios' *Chronicle*, in which the entry *Fidias eburneam Minervam facit* is assigned, with a slight dis-  
 30 arrangement in the Mss., to ol. 85, 2 = 439/8 B.C. <sup>13</sup>).

Accordingly the situation concerning the tradition about Pheidias is clearly and incontestably this <sup>14</sup>): we have to distinguish two groups in the tradition which, according to their contents, we may call the Pheidias (or Parthenon) group, and the Perikles (or War) group; or according to  
 35 their evidence, the Philochoros and the Aristophanes group respectively. Ph. deals primarily with the dedication of the great cult image of gold and ivory in 438/7 B.C. and incidentally with its maker, whose later life he treats in a short anticipatory digression <sup>15</sup>) down to his death in Elis. From this arrangement we are justified in drawing the inference that

no further mention of Pheidias was made in the *Atthis*<sup>16</sup>). Aristophanes, on the other hand, is dealing with the causes of the Great War; he is interested in Pheidias only so far as his 'misfortune' either by itself or combined with other events caused Perikles to kindle the flame of war by the Megarian psephism<sup>17</sup>). The poet gives no details either about the *πράττειν κακῶς* or the *τύχη* of Pheidias, which Perikles is anxious to avoid, an omission due less to the assumption that his audience was acquainted with it than to the fact that it was of no importance for his context. It is more surprising that Ephoros (Diodor. 12, 39, [1-2]), too, although narrating the charges against Pheidias and Anaxagoras, which were aimed at Perikles, says nothing about the issue of these trials; as his narrative, preserved by Diodoros, almost paraphrases the poet<sup>18</sup>), we shall not blame the excerptor, but assume rather that the historian also treated these matters not for their own sake but only because of their consequences in high politics: the charges in themselves were of no great importance for the *ἐχθροὶ τοῦ Περικλέους*; what mattered was the whole atmosphere created by these *κατηγορίαι καὶ διαβολαί*, the *διὰ τὸν φθόνον σπεύδοντες διαβαλεῖν τὴν τάνδρος ὑπεροχὴν τε καὶ δόξαν*. This gap in the authoritative account given by Ephoros may furnish the explanation for the hopeless divergencies in biographical tradition about Anaxagoras, which the Hellenistic biographers tried to fill up with arbitrary suggestions partly contradicting each other. It is probably in this biographical sphere that Plutarch (*Perikl.* 31, 5) found the tradition about the end of Pheidias — *ὁ μὲν οὖν Φειδίας εἰς τὸ δεσμωτήριον ἀπαχθεὶς ἐτελεύτησε νοσήσας, ὡς δὲ φασιν ἐνιοὶ φαρμάκοις, ἐπὶ διαβολῇ τοῦ Περικλέους τῶν ἐχθρῶν παρασκευασάντων* — which is suspiciously like the stories about the fate of Anaxagoras. The opponents of the Philochorean tradition may think themselves lucky that the variant of the *ἐνιοὶ* definitely makes Pheidias die in Athens; otherwise one would certainly have assumed a confusion with the death in the Elean prison<sup>19</sup>). The long and the short of these preliminaries is this: the Pheidias story as related by Ph. is complete, at least as to the last period of the artist in which (according to Ph.) he created his two principal works; the story as related by Aristophanes and presumably by Ephoros is incomplete, because neither the comic poet nor the historian was interested in Pheidias, but only in Perikles and the Great War.

Even more essential is the difference as to the documentation of the two groups of tradition which corresponds with the facts established hitherto. Ph. recorded the Pheidias story *ἐπὶ (Θε)οδώρου ἀρχοντος*: in this

year (438/7 B.C.) the gold and ivory statue of the Parthenos was put up in the 'Great Temple', and the documentary character of such a statement can as little be doubted as that of the similar note about the Propylaea from the following year 437/6 B.C. ὡς ἐπὶ Εὐθυμένοῦς ἀρχοντος οἰκοδομεῖν 5 ἤρξαντο Ἀθηναῖοι Μνησικλέους ἀρχιτεκτονῆτος (F 36). The only question is whether the second entry καὶ Φειδίας — ἐκρίθη is documentary in the same sense. Even here we cannot doubt that Ph. knew the decree which promised the informer a reward and the protection of the people <sup>20</sup>). What we can ask is, whether it was the only document at his disposal, <sup>10</sup> whether its date could be determined by the name of the town clerk only, and whether Ph. had no other information about the trial <sup>21</sup>). If all three questions have to be answered in the affirmative (and it is probable that they have to) we must admit that the dating of the trial in the year of the dedication is due to an inference the factual correctness or the <sup>15</sup> probability of which it is not our business to discuss here, for to do so would lead us beyond the establishment of the tradition, which is our first, and in this place our only, business <sup>22</sup>). Ed. Schwartz's cautious dating of the trial between 438/7 and 434/3 B.C. (the latter in his chronology the year of the Megarian psephisma) cannot be refuted. On the <sup>20</sup> contrary, if we have any doubts as to the date of Ph. the question will arise whether we had not better formulate even more cautiously. Schwartz still has a certain amount of confidence in Aristophanes, and because of him he prefers the later date: 'on the dating of the Megarian decree depends (to mention this incidentally) that of the Pheidias trial; for <sup>25</sup> though Aristophanes admits himself that the trial stood in no factual connexion with the psephism, he would certainly not have risked his insolent sally (*seinen frechen einfall*), had not the trial occurred *shortly before the fatal psephism*' (my italics). If we leave aside the unanswerable question as to the extent of the 'licence' of a comic poet <sup>23</sup>); if we waive <sup>30</sup> the counter-question whether it is not far more likely that Aristophanes mentioned Pheidias not because his trial had 'excited the people' over an accusation raised thirteen or sixteen years ago, but because his name was in all mouths at the time of the performance of the play, and the ensuing suggestion that it was his condemnation and his death in Elis <sup>35</sup> which awakened the memory of the events that had expelled him from Athens more than a decade before <sup>24</sup>)—the true question, in any case, is not about the chronological relation between trial and decree (inspite of Judeich, Schwartz, and others the two facts are not connected in any way) but what caused the poet to depart in *Peace* from the account

of the cause of the war which he had given five years ago in the *Acharnians*. In this play (notwithstanding the fanciful description of details) he keeps close enough to reality, the squabbles with Megara and the decree <sup>25</sup>); in the later play he embellishes the former account by the introduction of the Pheidias affair. Surely it is a fact (and it touches on the question of documentary foundation) that the invention is by no means confined to Pheidias and the events in Athens, in regard to which the poet admits it expressly and comprehensively, just because it is 'an insolent sally', but in exactly the same way he alters the motives of the Spartans: for the historical 'request' <sup>26</sup>) of the Spartans to raise the blockade inflicted on their allies he substitutes the corruption of the Spartans by the discontented subjects of the Athenian Empire <sup>27</sup>). The unreasonableness of expelling the goddess Eirene is the same for both parties, though the language is sharper in regard to Sparta. The only connexion with historical facts in the later account is the Megarian decree, and even that is not organic, for the hearers are supposed to supply the point that it is nothing but a pretext for the Spartans (if such; for Aristophanes himself motivates with the corruption of their leaders). No words should be wasted on the point that an account of this kind is no support for a conjecture that the charge against Pheidias had even been brought forward before the passing of the Megarian psephism <sup>28</sup>). Actually Ephoros seems to have recorded a different sequence of events, although either because of the vagueness of his chronology or because of the scantiness of the extract made by Diodoros, it remains uncertain when exactly in the course of what he calls the 'Peloponnesian War' the psephism was passed. He merely says that it was in force when, on the strength of the Megarian complaint, the Spartan ambassadors came to Athens, where the opponents of Perikles attempted to undermine his position by making the charges against Pheidias and Anaxagoras <sup>29</sup>). The question about the documentary foundation of this account thus turns on Ephoros, and unfortunately it can only be answered on general lines. We can state negatively that his report of the antecedents of the war, as far as Pheidias is drawn into them, is certainly not built on the psephisma of Glykon <sup>30</sup>), but we cannot assert positively that he was the first historian to connect Pheidias with the antecedents on the strength of Aristophanes' invention in his *Peace* (which he then would have taken at its face value), even if Diodoros (12, 40, 6) did find the lines of Aristophanes in Ephoros, which is probable. For Aristophanes speaks of Pheidias only; Ephoros mentioned at least Anaxagoras besides, and he

may have furnished more particulars<sup>31</sup>): he was the first historian to collect the gossip, which perhaps was not entirely gossip<sup>32</sup>), and which Thukydides passed over in a manner not altogether to be approved. Presumably Ephoros read about these events in one or more of the many pamphlets which, particularly after the war, attacked Athens and her democratic leaders<sup>33</sup>); and he was justified, even driven to it because of the one-sidedness of Thukydides, in drawing upon these sources, particularly if he was convinced (a conviction shared by some scholars even to-day<sup>34</sup>)) not only that the war could have been avoided but also that Perikles had provoked it for reasons of internal politics. Aristophanes and Ephoros gave that opinion in its crudest form at a time when the antagonism of the parties and their ideologies were still very much alive. Plutarch (*Perikl.* 31; not without the influence of Thukydides) raised matters to a higher plane, regarding as the question on which views diverge the quality of the personality that showed itself in this indubitable policy of war; he also asks whether Perikles estimated correctly the strength of the two hegemonic powers: τὴν μὲν οὖν ἀρχὴν ὅπως ἔσχεν (scil. ὁ πόλεμος) οὐ βραϊδίον γνῶναι, τοῦ δὲ μὴ λυθῆναι τὸ ψήφισμα πάντες ὡσαύτως τὴν αἰτίαν ἐπιφέρουσι τῷ Περικλεῖ· πλὴν οἱ μὲν ἐκ φρονήματος μέγαλου μετὰ γνώμης κατὰ τὸ βέλτιστον ἀπισχυρίσασθαι φασιν αὐτόν, πείραν ἐνδόσεως τὸ πρόσταγμα καὶ τὴν συγχώρησιν ἐξομολόγησιν ἀσθενείας ἡγούμενον, οἱ δὲ μᾶλλον αἰθαδεῖαι τινὶ καὶ φιλονικίαι πρὸς ἐνδειξιν ἰσχύος περιφρονῆσαι Λακεδαιμονίων.

The result of our investigation is not very satisfactory: we are not in a position to date the trial of Pheidias more accurately than by the statement that it happened in 438/7 B.C. at the earliest, the year to which Ph. expressly assigns it; we cannot strictly refute those scholars who put more faith in Aristophanes or in Ephoros than in Ph., who is working with the official documents about the dedication of the most famous cult statue of Athens and events connected with it. I have little doubt personally that Ph. is correct in stating that the denunciation actually belongs to the year of the dedication (it seems the natural thing)<sup>35</sup>); that it had not (or at least not primarily) a political purpose; that consequently the Pheidias affair was brought into the causes of the Peloponnesian War merely by an invention of Aristophanes indicated as such by the poet himself. But I admit that the first two points are not strictly demonstrable; those who maintain them to be so are mistaken about the tradition available to us, and possibly about that at the disposal of Ph. for dating a resolution of the people in the 'thirties. I

therefore merely add a word concerning the λεγόμενον about the death of Pheidias in Elis which Ph. has appended to his documentary statements. For the true 'question' concerning Pheidias, of course, does not consist in the discussion whether his condemnation in Athens took place in 438/7 B.C. or between 438/6 and 434/5 (or even as late as 432/1); the main point is whether he worked in Elis before or after he worked for Athens (to put it crudely at first). Literary tradition on this point is exceedingly poor. There are two versions contradicting each other and both, in fact, anonymous: according to the λεγόμενον reported by Ph. the artist, after having fled from Athens to Elis in 438/7 B.C., worked in the latter place for a while and was publicly executed there at some time<sup>36</sup>), the report evidently excluding a return to Athens at any time; according to Plutarch. *Perikl.* 31, 5 (who may or may not derive from Ephoros) he was accused in Athens on several points in connexion with the statue of Parthenos and died, or was poisoned ἐπὶ διαβολῇ τοῦ Περικλέους, while in prison awaiting trial. We may add on the one hand that there exists no evidence, either epigraphic or literary<sup>37</sup>), proving with any degree of certainty a sojourn of Pheidias in Athens after 438/7 B.C., and on the other hand that the new pieces of *IG<sup>2</sup> I 338* prove that the accounts mentioned concern the statue of Athena Promachos, and that consequently Pheidias was active for, and in, Athens during the 'fifties<sup>38</sup>). It is the business of the archaeologists alone to consider whether there still remains at least a possibility of the sequence in the work of Pheidias which was first upheld by Winckelman, who dated the Olympian Zeus as far back as the 'sixties<sup>39</sup>), or conversely whether any argument, archaeological or architectural, tells against assigning it to the 'thirties or 'twenties or to any other period between Promachos and Parthenos. Only the argument must be archaeological. A hundredth attempt of the kind so frequently made to force something from literary tradition which it cannot yield does not help but is more likely to obscure this tradition. If for instance Lippold<sup>40</sup>) recently thinks that 'there is no difficulty in assuming that Pheidias worked simultaneously at the Parthenos and the Zeus' I shall not contradict the hypothesis as such<sup>41</sup>), and even less shall I expect him 'simply to take on trust' the tradition of condemnation and death in Elis (as Frickenhaus does). But the hypothesis is neither firmly based on tradition, nor does it explain the difficulties with which tradition actually presents us, and the further suggestion that Ph. 'invented' the flight to Elis 'in order to exculpate the Athenians from the disgrace of ingratitude to Pheidias' directly contradicts tradition. Ph.

did not invent anything whatever: he reports a λεγόμενον. Those who assume it to be wrong will have to prove (or at least to make it appear probable) that its contents are impossible (or improbable); they must, moreover, show why it was invented. That would by no means be a simple thing to do: the interpretation of Lippold presupposes (or so it seems) that Pheidias was innocent, that his innocence was proved later on, that it was generally believed, that Ph. therefore found it necessary to defend the Athenians, and that he found but one expedient—the slanderous remark that Pheidias stole in Elis too <sup>43</sup>). The succinct annalistic entry καὶ Φειδίας — δόξας παραλογίζεσθαι ἐκριθῆ is no foundation for such a series of inferences; if it is not simply neutral it sounds rather as if Ph. had no doubt of Pheidias' guilt. In all other respects the meaning of his entry is sufficiently clear: Ph. was interested in the fate of one of the greatest Athenian artists; he may have been surprised that such a man seemed to have been embezzling whenever an opportunity offered; anyhow he noted a corresponding 'rumour' which indisputably referred to his life in Elis and to the time after 438/7 B.C. What surprises us is quite another matter: we find it hard to believe that it should have been impossible to obtain the authentic tradition about the events in Elis; but it is a fact that Ph. was not in possession of a reliable tradition, nor do we find anything elsewhere in literature. Therefore things must remain at this: the biographer of Pheidias cannot decide unhesitatingly for either of the stories about the end of the artist. Certainly the statement of Plutarch is discredited from the first not only by its connexion with the invention of Aristophanes, but even more by its own vagueness <sup>44</sup>); and if Ph. had spoken in his own name there would exist no problem at all. But he did not, and nobody will contend that before the period of scientific biography fewer slanderous inventions were put about; the contrary is more likely to be correct. Personally I do not doubt for a moment that as far as things happened in Athens Ph. gives us the documentary facts of a simple trial περὶ κλοπῆς <sup>45</sup>); that φυγὼν still belongs to this documentary report and that λέγεται refers solely to the events in Elis. But I am not at all sure that the report, as 'excerpted by the Scholiast', is complete.

σταθμὸν τάλαντων μδ] Thukyd. 2, 13, 5 ἔτι δὲ καὶ τὰ ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων ἱερῶν προσετίθει (scil. Perikles) χρήματα οὐκ ὀλίγα, οἷς χρῆσασθαι αὐτούς, καὶ ἦν πάνυ ἐξείργωνται πάντων καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς θεοῦ τοῖς περικειμένοις χρυσοῖς <sup>46</sup>). ἀπέβαινε δ' ἔχον τὸ ἄγαλμα τεσσαράκοντα τάλαντα <sup>46</sup>) σταθμὸν χρυσοῦ ἀπέφθου, καὶ περιαιρετὸν εἶναι ἅπαν. The weight is lacking in Diod. 12, 39, 1



(ch. 40, 3 it is given in the speech of Perikles following Thukydides); Plutarch *Perikl.* 31; Aristodem. 104 F 1 ch. 16, 1. It is remarkable that the last substitutes ἐλεφαντίνη Ἀθηνᾶ for the technically correct ἀγάλμα τὸ χρυσοῦν. There must have existed a great many writings about the two main works, and they cannot all have been as late as Kallimachos in the *Iamboi* (F 196 Pf), who, describing the Olympian Zeus, διηγεῖται μῆκος, ὕψος, πλάτος βάσεως θρόνου ὑποποδίου αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ὄση ἢ δαπάνη, δημιουργὸν δὲ Φειδίαν Χαρμίδου Ἀθηναῖον. Similar particulars concerning the Parthenos must not be expected in the *Atthis*; we have no reason to  
 10 assume that the Scholiast abridged here substantially if at all. Unfortunately the so-called Pheidias papyrus<sup>46a</sup>) because of its mutilated condition does not yield much either on this subject or otherwise. Περικλέους ἐπιστατοῦντος, Φειδίου δὲ ποιήσαντος] The scholion has preserved the full formula as against F 35 where (the abbreviated) Harpokration  
 15 mentions the architect of the Propylaea only. Cf. Diodor. 12, 39, 1 (431/0 B.C.) τὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἀγάλμα Φειδίας μὲν κατεσκευάει, Περικλῆς δὲ ὁ Ξανθίππου καθεσταμένος ἦν ἐπιμελητής; Aristodem. 104 F 1 ch. 16, 1 τῶν Ἀθηναίων κατασκευαζόντων τὴν ἐλεφαντίνην Ἀθηνᾶν καὶ ἀποδειξάντων ἐργεπιστάτην τὸν Περικλέα, τεχνίτην δὲ Φειδίαν. Plutarch *Perikl.* 31, 2,  
 20 deriving from gossip biographies which are interested in Pheidias only so far as he furnishes the χειρίστη μὲν αἰτία πασῶν, ἔχουσα δὲ πλείστους μάρτυρας of the outbreak of the war (ch. 31, 2), substitutes general phrases for the technical terms: Φειδίας ὁ πλάστης ἐργολάβος μὲν ἦν τοῦ ἀγάλματος, ὡσπερ εἴρηται (ch. 14), φίλος δὲ τῷ Περικλεῖ γενόμενος καὶ μέγιστον  
 25 παρ' αὐτῷ δυναθεὶς κτλ.; in ch. 13, 14 also he follows a statement which is only seemingly documentary — ὁ δὲ Φειδίας εἰργάζετο μὲν τῆς θεοῦ τὸ χρυσοῦν ἔδος, καὶ τούτου δημιουργὸς ἐν τῇ στήλῃ εἶναι γέγραπται — by the phrase πάντα δ' ἦν σχεδὸν ἐπ' αὐτῷ, καὶ πᾶσιν . . . ἐπεστάται τοῖς τεχνίταις διὰ φίλαν Περικλέους, which is the introduction to more gossip. Actually  
 30 the management was in the hands of a board probably consisting of ten members, the ἐπιστάται ἀγάλματος χρυσοῦ I G<sup>a</sup> I 358<sup>47</sup>); Perikles may have been its chairman (if only because he was a permanent member as of other boards concerned with building)<sup>48</sup>), and his position on the board may have been similar to that among the strategoi. This was not  
 35 expressed in his title, though he is sometimes described as ἐπιμελητής.

καὶ Φειδίας — ἐκρίθη] παραλογίζεσθαι τὸν ἐλέφαντα cannot very well mean anything but 'cheat', 'cooking the accounts', which then must relate to the use of the ivory put at his disposal by the ἐπιστάται. The Scholiast paraphrases by ὑφέλετο (he stole) and, in the trial at Elis,

with νοσφίσασθαι (to purloin); Aristodemos also says ἀλόντος Φειδίου ἐπὶ νοσφισμῶι; in Diodoros the informers undertake to prove πολλά τῶν ἱερῶν χρημάτων ἔχοντα Φειδίαν, ἐπισταμένου καὶ συνεργοῦντος τοῦ ἐπιμελητοῦ Περικλέους; and Plutarch (who also makes the informer Menon demand 5 ἄδειαν ἐπὶ μηνύσει καὶ κατηγορίαι τοῦ Φειδίου) states that κλοπαὶ οὐκ ἠλέγχοντο. Accordingly the tradition can be analyzed easily enough. Ph. clearly indicates a charge κλοπῆς δημοσίων (ἱερῶν) χρημάτων (not ἱεροσυλίας, as Diodoros has it) <sup>49</sup> which concerns Pheidias alone and which ended in the condemnation of the accused (perhaps *in absentia*); he evidently 10 assumed that the case came before a court <sup>50</sup>, and it does not look as if he doubted the guilt of the artist; nor could he have done so if he had the psephism of Glykon before him <sup>51</sup>). We cannot decide whether apart from this he had any other documentary tradition. In any case, he seems to have restricted himself to the brief entry (with the digression about 15 the further fate of Pheidias), the wording of which seems to prove that Perikles was not concerned in the matter at all, and that the charge against Pheidias was not brought forward on the occasion of the official *euthynai* of the epistatai <sup>52</sup>). This would mean that he regarded the matter as a purely criminal case worth to be mentioned in the *Atthis* merely 20 because of the object and because of the person of the accused <sup>53</sup>), not as a political trial. In view of his assigning the trial to 438/7 B.C. this does not surprise us, and probably he was right <sup>54</sup>). Contrary to Ph. Diodoros 12, 39, 1 (= Ephoros) and Plutarch. *Perikl.* 31 first agree in this that the charge brought forward against the artist shortly before the outbreak 25 of the war had a political character: behind the informer(s) are 'the opponents of Perikles' <sup>55</sup>). The question about the guilt recedes into the background; Ephoros talks of φθόνος and διαβολαί, and Plutarch states expressly that κλοπαὶ οὐκ ἠλέγχοντο. This is important because it shows that for this version, too, the charge κλοπῆς, which must be assumed for 30 the report of Ph., was the starting-point. The parts of the informer and the Assembly are all the more prominent <sup>56</sup>). In the Assembly, according to Ephoros, the opponents of Perikles achieved the imprisonment of Pheidias (of course, for the purpose of investigation); they further demanded proceedings ἱεροσυλίας <sup>57</sup>) against Perikles (of course, on the 35 strength of the denunciation πολλά τῶν ἱερῶν χρημάτων ἔχοντα Φειδίαν, ἐπισταμένου καὶ συνεργοῦντος . . . Περικλέους). Here either the extract of Diodoros from Ephoros breaks off, or the original report of the latter <sup>58</sup>), which is still fairly simple and preserves the forms of the actual proceedings in a political trial of that kind. The biographical sources of

Plutarch provide considerably more particulars, and his account is vague or even impossible legally, although Plutarch took great trouble to cover up the most obvious contradictions: the people is willing to hear the charge, and an immediate inquiry takes place in the Assembly in the course of which the charge of embezzlement as to the gold (there is no mention of ivory) at once appears to be untenable or, rather, is dropped at a word of Perikles <sup>59</sup>). But that is by no means the end of the business: ἡ δὲ δόξα τῶν ἔργων ἐπέζηε φθόνῳ τὸν Φειδίαν; a new point is raised—he had put his own portrait and that of Perikles on the shield of the Parthenos—; Pheidias is sent to prison where he dies; (variants about the cause of his death, the whole report strongly resembling the alleged proceedings against Anaxagoras); the informer is rewarded. What for? Since his μήνυσις has broken down (κλοπαὶ μὲν οὐκ ἠλέγχοντο) he ought to have been punished. When and where were the new charges brought: in the same Assembly or at some time later? And by whom? Was a motion for proceedings brought forward (it could only have been a γραφή ἀσεβείας), and how far was it directed against Perikles, too? There is no need to discuss these questions seriously <sup>60</sup>), or to ask whether the malicious gossip in *Perikl.* 13, 14 ff., for which Plutarch cites Comedy and Stesimbrotos, belongs to this context. It is surprising that modern scholars have found in this report the 'unadulterated tradition' <sup>61</sup>), for it seems indisputable that Biography added to the plainer narrative of Ephoros, thus depriving it of lucidity generally. Biography cannot have taken its additional matter from Aristophanes, for his vague πράξας κακῶς <sup>25</sup> only shows the gap to be filled, the filling being presumably carried out by later pamphleteers and by the legends about artists <sup>62</sup>).

The upshot is that we know nothing about the trial of Pheidias beyond what Ph. states and what the Glykon psephisma tells us. This evidence hardly leaves a serious doubt of the guilt of the artist, and we infer that <sup>30</sup> Perikles dropped the man who had betrayed his confidence, too. We cannot tell whether he liked it or not, but Perikles was scrupulous in matters of money <sup>63</sup>). The modern assumption of a community of minds and ideas existing between him and Pheidias is modern and need not detain us here <sup>64</sup>). The fancies can ultimately be traced back to the fact that <sup>35</sup> the creator of the Promachos, the Parthenos, and the Olympian Zeus had a strong hold on the imagination of the public; he gradually overshadowed all other artists, even the great architects with whom Perikles worked. The reasons are easily to be recognized, and the fact is obvious e.g. in Diodoros 12, 1, 3 and in the biography of Plutarch <sup>65</sup>). In order not to be

- accused of unfruitful scepticism I shall state this: I am convinced that the biographical tradition about Pheidias as given by Aristophanes and Ephoros (who partly derives from him) is without any value, but, on the other hand, I am convinced that Ph. gives us the true facts, perhaps with the exception of the year of the trial, and even here I see no reason for serious doubts. Archaeologists would make life easier for themselves if they acknowledged his evidence instead of reviving the Aristophanean fancy together with the tradition of the gossip writers in slightly varied forms every few years.
- 10 (122) The comic formula expressing world-wide fame raised the question what were the relations between Meton and Kolonos, and incidentally which of the several Kolonoi is meant <sup>1)</sup>. The question, which apparently cannot be answered with certainty <sup>2)</sup>, concerns us here only in so far as the Scholiast quotes Ph. in order to test by his statements a number of
- 15 explanations given by earlier commentators. The result is: (1) the contention of Euphronios that Meton τῶν δῆμων ἦν ἐκ Κολωνοῦ is simply wrong, for he was from the deme Leukonoe <sup>3)</sup>; (2) he seems to find possible, but not demonstrable, the opinion of Kallistratos that Meton put up an astronomical anathema ἐν Κολωνῶι, which (this seems to be the
- 20 meaning of τῆ) is not the famous sun-dial of the Pnyx; (3) again he plainly rejects (ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔστι) the supposition of τινές that Kolonos is the name of a quarter including the Pnyx and Kolonos Mithios (*i.e.* the Agoraios), the name of the quarter being in fact Melite <sup>4)</sup>. We can approximately reconstruct the entry in the *Atthis*: 'Αψεῦδης\* (deme) ἄρχων . . . καὶ Μέτων
- 25 Παισσανίου Λευκονοεὺς ἡλιοτρόπιον ἀνέθηκεν πρὸς τῶι τείχει τῶι ἐν τῆι Πνυκί. To the Scholiast, not to Ph., belong: (1) the more precise dating of Apseudes by the addition of his successor, the well-known Pythodoros; (2) the statement made only for the sake of criticism ἐν Κολωνῶι μὲν αὐτὸν οὐδὲν θεῖναι λέγει (*i.e.* 'I — the Scholiast, — do not find anything about
- 30 it in Philochoros') which, in consideration of the attempts still made at finding something, is not quite unimportant; (3) the qualified definition of the locality ἐν τῆι νῦν οὐσῃ ἐκκλησίαι, which is impossible for Ph. in this form. Ph. probably (and perhaps already in his 'Ἐπιγράμματα Ἀττικὰ) saw and copied the dedicatory inscription himself. As unfortunately in the
- 35 *Atthis* he does not seem to have given it verbatim, we are only able to state that it is fairly certain to have contained the full name (*i.e.* with his deme) of the dedicator and possibly the date <sup>5)</sup>. Whether it also designated the votive gift as a sun-dial remains uncertain mainly because we do not know whether it was cast in poetical form; necessary it was not, for

anybody could see what the anathema was. Thus this designation may belong to Ph. as well as the statement of the place πρὸς τῶν τεύχει τῶν ἐν τῇ Πνυκί. This definition of the locality is clear, serviceable and intelligible to every Athenian; if the wall is understood to be the *diateichisma* of Kleon <sup>6</sup>) it 'fixes its position by reference to prominent landmarks familiar to his readers'. The latest treatment of the Pnyx <sup>7</sup>) suggests as the position of the sun-dial 'the rectangular foundation bedding in the western part of the rock-cut terrace' between the meeting-place of the Assembly and the Long Hall in the south (which it assigns to the Thes-  
 10 mophorion): 'the situation was excellent for the purpose since here the instrument would catch the earliest beams of the rising and the latest beams of the setting sun summer and winter alike'. The paper mentions as an 'interesting coincidence that the telescope of the modern observatory stands on the crest of the Pnyx hill some 150 metres west of the  
 15 rock-hewn base'.

The delication of the sun-dial is not directly connected with the scientific achievement which rendered Meton famous, and which from the time of Theophrastos at the latest is always connected with his name (and that of his disciple Euktemon <sup>8</sup>)); it is this achievement because of  
 20 which the scholiast calls him ἄριστος ἀστρονόμος, and which Diodoros reports in detail under the year 433/2 B.C. <sup>9</sup>): the famous observation of the summer solstice on Skirophorion 13 in the year of Apseudes (= 27th June 432 B.C.) and the establishment of the Enneakaidekaeteris of the 'Metonian year' starting from that date <sup>10</sup>). We cannot tell whether  
 25 Ph. reported this achievement (perhaps in a more or less detailed digression like the one about Pheidias with which we became acquainted in F 121) and whether he gave a kind of βίος of the scientist. But the Scholiast does not seem to have found any further information about Meton in the *Atthis*, nor anything he could have used to explain Phryni-  
 30 chos' Μέτων ὁ τὰς χρήνας ἄγων; Aristophanes, too, only mentioned the sun-dial in his *Daitaleis* of 428/7 B.C. <sup>11</sup>), thus yielding a *terminus ante* well agreeing with Ph.'s dating of the anathema. The evidence about the Metonian year seems to tell against the assumption that its inventor put up in public a model, or a schedule, or a meteorological calendar  
 35 constructed on the basis of the Enneakaidekaeteris—in short, another anathema <sup>12</sup>); Meton rather appears to have published his theory in a technical paper of the sort which became more frequent during the fifth century. In any case, the fact remains that the Metonian intercalary cycle, which was not the first of its kind (not even in Athens <sup>13</sup>)) nor the

last either, was certainly not officially introduced when it appeared, or soon after or at all: if it had been Ph. must have mentioned the introduction. There can, in my opinion, be no serious doubt that—to say it with Kahrstedt <sup>14</sup>)—the establishment of the Enneakaidekaeteris 'was a scientific achievement . . . not an act of the government and not a law.

The intercalation, just the same as before, rests with the archon, who according to circumstances and sometimes by a decree of the people is ordered to intercalate irregularly. As long as no decree was passed the archon could intercalate to the best of his knowledge; lacking in professional knowledge himself he might either obtain it from Meton or, proceeding according to tradition, intercalate three months in every eighth year; or he could neglect everything from sheer mathematical ignorance—that was his own concern'. This statement may be somewhat exaggerated, but it is understood that the Attic calendar was not put in order as an immediate consequence of Meton's scheme: the jokes of Aristophanes speak a clear language <sup>15</sup>).

(123) The comparison of the two versions of the scholion shows that an ample discussion of the puzzling count of the poet has come down to us in a much epitomized form. Evidently nobody knew what to do about the thirteen years, and the second version of the scholion gives it up in despair with the remark *οἱ δὲ ποιηταὶ πολλάκις αὐτοσχεδιάζουσιν εἰς τοὺς χρόνους*. Quoting Ph. and referring also to Thukydides, the interpreters naturally counted the years of the war from archon Pythodoros 432/1 B.C. <sup>1</sup>) to Alkaios 422/1 B.C. (mentioned in the second version), in whose year the play was performed and the peace of Nikias concluded. This count does not yield thirteen years but only ten, or (if both terms are included) eleven; and that Aristophanes also calculated thus is shown in their opinion by the passage in the *Acharnians* where 426/5 B.C. is called the sixth year of the war. The mention of Isarchos (424/3 B.C.) is explained by the fact that in his year the armistice of Laches had been concluded, and one of the interpreters evidently tried to understand the figure of the poet from this point (*πῆι μὲν ἀνάπαυλαν, πῆι δὲ πόλεμον γενέσθαι*). But that proved impossible, too, for there are only eight (nine) years from Pythodoros to Isarchos <sup>2</sup>) as the first version confirms by a reference to Thukydides <sup>3</sup>), while the second arrives at the same result by adding to the six years of the *Acharnians* the interval between Isarchos and the performance of the play. No name of an archon is corrupt, no archon is assigned to a wrong year <sup>4</sup>); what is wrong is the figure *ἑῷ* alone <sup>5</sup>). It is clear that the poet cannot be explained here from history, but only

from the character of the much discussed number thirteen which here as elsewhere is an indefinite number used to express plenty <sup>4</sup>).

(124) The Scholia assign Euripides' *Andromache* (for which they did not find an accurate date in the Didaskaliai) to the time shortly before the outbreak of the Great War or at its opening (διὰ τὸν ἐνεστῶτα πόλεμον, ἐν ἀρχαῖς τοῦ Πελοποννησιακοῦ πολέμου), and they refer to Ph. It is quite conceivable that he discussed the legal questions and that he found the wrong to be on the side of Sparta: the question as to what the *σπονδαί* of 446/5 B.C. allowed and what they did not, pervades the whole of Thukydides' first book. But the armistice of 424/3 B.C. and the conduct of Brasidas and his government in the matter of Skione and Mende led to similar discussions <sup>1</sup>); Thukydides, who ought to know, finds the wrong on the side of Sparta at least in the case of Skione <sup>2</sup>), and Ph.'s opinion (F 129) seems to be the same. It is not our business here to broach the question of the date of the performance of the *Andromache* <sup>3</sup>); there is much to be said in favour of 423/2 B.C. when the irritation of Athens against Sparta seems to have been stronger and more undivided than at the beginning of the war <sup>4</sup>). But that would not help us to determine what F 124 refers to: the extract of the Scholia is too vague.

(125) See on Istros 334 F 30. Because of Androtion we shall not hesitate to assign the quotation of Ph. to the fourth book of the *Atthis*, though he may also have treated the *μυθία* in one of his antiquarian works.

(126) Ph. had many occasions for mentioning Perdikkas from 433/2 B.C. onward, but the statement of the length of his reign may point to an entry of his death at a somewhat later date, which we cannot determine accurately. According to Thukyd. 7, 9 Perdikkas still reigned in summer 414 B.C., but in 2, 100 he does not mention the year of Archelaos' accession. According to Diodor. 13, 49, 1 the year 410/9 belongs already to Archelaos, but his Macedonian list is of as little value for the fifth century as are the other witnesses, who all date the death of Perdikkas earlier than is possible according to Thukydides <sup>1</sup>): 418/7 B.C. Diodoros; 420/19 Marm. Par. A 61; 425/4 the so-called Bad Lists; 433/2 the *Kanon* of Eusebios (in Hieronymos; 431/0 in the Armenian). We have to follow Thukydides as far as he goes, and we should like to assume that Ph. followed a more reliable tradition; for he evidently consulted for the duration of Perdikkas' reign the latest national source, the *Μακεδονικά* of the elder Marsyas of Pella (no. 135/6) <sup>2</sup>). This author, being a *σύντροφος* of Alexander and brother of Antigonos (Monophthalmos), evidently appeared to him reliable <sup>3</sup>).

(127) Thukyd. 3, 86, 1<sup>1</sup>) τοῦ δ' αὐτοῦ θέρους τελευτῶντος (427 B.C.) Ἰθνηναῖοι εἴκοσι ναῦς ἔστειλαν ἐς Σικελίαν καὶ Λάχητα τὸν Μελανώπου στρατηγὸν αὐτῶν καὶ Χαροιάδην τὸν Εὐφιλῆτου. 115, 2 (winter 426/5 B.C.) Πυθόδωρον τὸν Ἰσολόχου Ἰθνηναῖον στρατηγὸν καταλαμβάνουσιν ἐπὶ τὰς ναῦς 5 διάδοχον ὧν Λάχης ἦρχεν . . . (5) τὸν μὲν οὖν ἕνα τῶν στρατηγῶν ἀπέστειλαν Πυθόδωρον ὀλίγαις ναυσί, Σοφοκλέα δὲ τὸν Σωστρατίδου καὶ Εὐρυμέδοντα τὸν Θουκλέους ἐπὶ τῶν πλειόνων νεῶν ἀποπέμψειν ἐμμελλον. 4, 65, 3 (summer 424) ἐλθόντας δὲ τοὺς στρατηγοὺς οἱ ἐν τῇ πόλει Ἰθνηναῖοι τοὺς μὲν 10 φυγῆι ἐξημίωσαν, Πυθόδωρον καὶ Σοφοκλέα, τὸν δὲ τρίτον Εὐρυμέδοντα χρήματα ἐπράξαντο, ὡς ἐξὸν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἐν Σικελίαι καταστρέψασθαι δώροις πεισθέντες ἀποχωρήσειαν.

It is evident that the interpreters did not find anything in the *Atthis* about the trial in which Kleon had involved Laches. Laches' name did not occur in Ph. under the year 423/2 B.C.; he was mentioned in 427/6 15 B.C. when he was sent to Sicily as strategos<sup>2</sup>), and probably in 426/5 when he was relieved by Sophokles and Pythodoros, whose fate Ph. may have reported by anticipation, unless (which is more probable) the scholia combined the entries of two years. The tradition is simple and clear: Ph. does not know of, or does not mention, a charge against 20 Laches; it is the same with Thukydides, as his silence proves, for he reports the proceedings against Laches' successors in the command with great emphasis. The only witness for an accusation is Aristophanes, and there is no doubt of his meaning the time of the performance of the play, 423/2 B.C.: the chorus appears because their 'patron' Kleon has 25 told them to come on that day; and the parody of the trial, in which the κύων Κυδαθηναίεὺς accuses Λάβης Αἰξωνεὺς τὸν τυρὸν ὅτι μόνος κατήσθιεν τὸν Σικελικόν takes place in the course of the play (v. 891 ff.). These facts allow of two inferences: (1) contrary to the prevailing opinion<sup>3</sup>) no charge was brought against Laches after he had been relieved in winter 30 426/5 B.C. from his (prolonged) Sicilian command; (2) if (I say 'if') in 423 B.C. a charge was brought, which was connected in any way with his command, it cannot have been concerned with his conduct of the war<sup>4</sup>) but was at the utmost a γραφὴ κλοπῆς or the like<sup>5</sup>). But the hints of the poet are by no means clear; on the contrary, they seem to be kept 35 deliberately vague, and against the whole suggestion the insuperable objection arises at once, that such a charge is plainly impossible when Laches got successfully through his εὐθυνα three years before<sup>6</sup>). It is hardly understandable that general opinion, in contradiction to a clear tradition, maintains that 'on the return of Laches to Athens Kleon



brought to justice the strategos removed from his post' 7). It is even less understandable that Kahrstedt 8) adduced F 127 as proof (the only one) of his statement that 'no charge need confine itself to offences committed during the current year of office; in the case of continued strategiai one goes back to events of a former year of office; quite logically because λόγοι have taken place meanwhile, but not εἶθυναί'. But in the case of Laches a continuous series of strategiai is out of the question, for in 425/4 B.C. he certainly was not strategos 8), and, though his command was prolonged, he was almost certainly in 426/5 10). If after his recall a charge had been brought against him, the trial could not have been delayed for years: we are still far from the times of Demosthenes when an affair like this could be dragged out for years by means of tricks. The question therefore must be formulated thus: is the trial of 423 B.C., attested by the comic poet alone, a reality at all, or (to qualify the question) did a trial with which Kleon threatened Laches in that year really take place? 'Malicious litigation' is possible in 424/3 as well as in 423/2 B.C.; it is also credible that in the latter year it was directed against the conservative and the peace party. If at that time a charge against Laches was brought, and if the trial took place, it ended in acquittal; the parody proves that and so do historical facts 11). But the parody does, of course, not prove that a formal charge was brought at all. An angry outbreak of Kleon in the Assembly, the threat of a charge, unfounded imputations concerning Laches' conduct in Sicily, may be a sufficient basis for the poet's witty invention of the lawsuit against the dog—if he was in need at all of facts. If there are facts behind the invention (I am loth to draw the inference confidently), we are not in a position to state *how much* Aristophanes invented, because we do not know how Kleon set about in trying to get rid of the man who in the document of the armistice made in the spring appears as its mover; but that he invented is shown, in my opinion, by his going back to Laches' activity in Sicily. What we see clearly from the play is the (general and probably political) antagonism existing between Kleon and Laches in 424/3 B.C., and Droysen 12) (although he does neither doubt the reality of the trial nor scrutinize the evidence, but rightly confines himself to putting questions 13)), is cautious as well as correct when stating: 'it is credible enough that the charge of Kleon was a political trick'. The details were quickly forgotten, and we need not wonder that the *Atthis* yielded nothing to the commentators.

(128) Thukyd. 4, 15 ἐς δὲ τὴν Σπάρτην ὡς ἠγγέλθη τὰ γεγενημένα περὶ

Πύλον . . . ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς πρὸς τοὺς στρατηγούς τῶν Ἀθηναίων, ἣν ἐθέλωσι, σπονδὰς ποιησάμενους τὰ περὶ Πύλον ἀποστεῖλαι ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας πρέσβεις περὶ ξυμβάσεως . . . . . (16, 3) αἱ μὲν σπονδαὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις ἐγένοντο, καὶ αἱ νῆες παρεδόθησαν οὕσαι περὶ ἐξήκοντα, καὶ οἱ πρέσβεις ἀπεστάλησαν. ἀφι-  
 5 κόμενοι δὲ ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας ἐλεξαν τοιάδε . . . . (21, 2) οἱ δὲ τὰς μὲν σπονδὰς, ἔχοντες τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐν τῇ νήσῳ, ἤδη σφίσι ἐνόμιζον ἐτοιμούς εἶναι, ὅπταν βούλωνται ποιεῖσθαι πρὸς αὐτούς, τοῦ δὲ πλέονος ὠρέγοντο. (3) μάλιστα δ' αὐτούς ἐνήγγε Κλέων ὁ Κλεαινέτου ἀνὴρ δημαγωγὸς κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν χρόνον ὧν καὶ τῷ πλήθει πιθανώτατος, καὶ ἔπεισεν ἀποκρίνασθαι ὡς χρῆ . . . . (22, 1)  
 10 οἱ δὲ πρὸς μὲν τὴν ἀπόκρισιν οὐδὲν ἀντεῖπον, ξυνέδρους δὲ σφίσι ἐκέλευον ἐλεῖσθαι οἷτινες λέγοντες καὶ ἀκούοντες περὶ ἐκάστου ξυμβήσονται κατὰ ἡσυχίαν ὅτι ἂν πείθωσιν ἀλλήλους. (2) Κλέων δὲ ἐνταῦθα δὴ πολὺς ἐνέκειτο, λέγων γιγνώσκειν μὲν καὶ πρότερον οὐδὲν ἐν νῶι ἔχοντας δίκαιον αὐτούς, σαφὲς δὲ εἶναι καὶ νῦν, οἷτινες τῷ μὲν πλήθει οὐδὲν ἐθέλουσιν εἰπεῖν, ὀλί-  
 15 γους δὲ ἀνδράσι ξύνεδροι βούλονται γίγνεσθαι· ἀλλὰ εἴ τι ὑγιὲς διανοοῦνται, λέγειν ἐκέλευσεν ἅπασιν. (3) ὀρώντες δὲ οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι οὔτε σφίσι οἶόν τε ὂν ἐν πλήθει εἰπεῖν, εἴ τι καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς ξυμφορᾶς ἐδόκει αὐτοῖς ξυγχαρεῖν, μὴ ἐς τοὺς ξυμμάχους διαβληθῶσιν εἰπόντες καὶ οὐ τυχόντες, οὔτε τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἐπὶ μετριοῖς ποιήσοντας & προυκαλοῦντο, ἀνεχώρησαν ἐκ τῶν Ἀθηναίων  
 20 ἄπρακτοι 1).

What the Scholia excerpted from Ph. refers to the Spartan embassy which went to Athens immediately after the blockade of Sphacteria and to the armistice concluded there probably at the end of June 425 B.C.<sup>2</sup>). It is possible that the half-sentence opening with δέ was preceded by a  
 25 clause with μὲν which reported the conclusion of the σπονδαί with the strategoi at Pylos. The half-sentence looks like a verbatim quotation, but that may be deceptive. In the second sentence the λεγόμενον seems to be impaired either by abridgement or by a gap in the manuscript; but Ed. Meyer's supplement from the second version<sup>3</sup>), which is confused and evidently not accurately expressed, is refuted by Thukyd.  
 30 4, 22: the very point on which Kleon insists is the rejection of the Spartans' request for a discussion not in the Assembly but in a select circle, and Ph. can hardly have differed. His account of the conduct of the Assembly provides the external reason for the wish to discuss the  
 35 matter κατὰ ἡσυχίαν, for which Thukydides gives the internal reason (μὴ ἐς τοὺς ξυμμάχους διαβληθῶσιν). It is wrong to say simply that 'Ph. has preserved more accurate information about the detail of the events'. Thukydides goes into the details more than he usually does, not so much because the question is about an offer of peace but because he wants to

make it clear that this offer was rejected by the influence of Kleon who alone is to be blamed for the rejection. In this point too (as in the number of the ships) Ph. agrees as to the matter: Κλέωνος δὲ ἀντειπόντος ταῖς διαλύσεσιν. The only difference is this: it is not clear from Thukydides whether a vote was taken at all, whereas Ph. attests the division mentioning some particulars as to the clash of opinions and expressly stating what in this case we have to read between the lines in Thukydides <sup>4</sup>). We miss these particulars as a consequence of the condition of the text, and, unfortunately, we cannot tell with certainty whether *στασιάζουσι* is used in the intransitive or in the transitive sense <sup>5</sup>); in my opinion the anonymous quotation (*λέγεται*) recommends the second alternative. That means: exactly as in F 121 Ph. added to the report, which he (or Androktion) may mainly have taken over from Thukydides, a detail from another source which he did not wish to guarantee. What we have of his report (for as in F 121 the scholia did not copy verbatim the *λέγεται* sentence, or the later scholiasts cut down this passage) is too succinct for us to maintain confidently that he made use of pamphletistic literature generally or of the tenth book of Theopompos in particular, which criticised in no friendly spirit the manners of Kleon both in public and in private, referring to his behaviour on certain occasions <sup>6</sup>).

(129) Thukyd. 4, 120, 1 <sup>1</sup>) περὶ δὲ τὰς ἡμέρας ταύτας αἷς ἐπήρχοντο (during the negotiation of the armistice of Elaphebolion 423 B.C.) Σκιώνη ἐν τῇ Παλλήνῃ πόλιν ἀπέστη ἀπ' Ἀθηναίων πρὸς Βρασιδαν . . . (122, 4) ὡς δ' ἀπήγγελλεν ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας ὁ Ἀριστάνουμος περὶ αὐτῶν, οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι εὐθύς ἐτοίμοι ἦσαν στρατεῦειν ἐπὶ τὴν Σκιώνην . . . (123, 1) ἐν τούτῳ δὲ Μένδη ἀφίσταται αὐτῶν . . . (3) οἱ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι εὐθύς πυθόμενοι, πολλῶν ἔτι μᾶλλον ὀργισθέντες παρεσκευάζοντο ἐπ' ἀμφοτέρας τὰς πόλεις . . . (124, 1) Βρασιδαν δὲ καὶ Περδικίαν ἐν τούτῳ στρατεύουσιν ἅμα ἐπὶ Ἀρραβαῖον τὸ δεύτερον ἐς Λύγκον . . . (129, 1) Βρασιδαν δὲ ἀναχωρήσας ἐκ Μακεδονίας ἐς Τορώνην καταλαμβάνει Ἀθηναίους Μένδην ἤδη ἔχοντας . . . (2) ὑπὸ γὰρ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον τοῖς ἐν τῇ Λύγκῳ ἐξέπλευσαν ἐπὶ τε τὴν Μένδην καὶ τὴν Σκιώνην οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, ὥσπερ παρεσκευάζοντο, καισὶ μὲν πενήκοντα, ὧν ἦσαν δέκα Χίαι, ὀπλίταις δὲ χιλίοις ἑαυτῶν καὶ τοξόταις ἑξακοσίοις καὶ Θραξὶ μισθοῦ τοῖς χιλίοις καὶ ἄλλοις τῶν αὐτόθεν ζυμμάχων πελτασταῖς . . . (130, 7) ἐπειδὴ δὲ τὰ περὶ τὴν Μένδην κατέσχον, ἐπὶ τὴν Σκιώνην ἐχώρουν . . . (131, 2) προσβαλόντες δ' αὐτῷ κατὰ κράτος οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ μάχῃ ἐκρούσαντες τοὺς ἐπόντας ἐστρατοπεδεύσαντό τε καὶ ἐς τὸν περιτειχισμὸν . . . παρεσκευάζοντο . . . (133, 4) καὶ ἡ Σκιώνη τοῦ θέρους ἤδη τελευτῶντος περι-

επετείχιστό τε παντελῶς, καὶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐπ' αὐτῇ φυλακῇ καταλιπόντες ἀνεχώρησαν τῷ ἄλλω στρατῷ. The *Vespaie* was performed in 423/2 B.C., the events quoted from Ph. fall in the year of Isarchos 424/3, i.e. ἐνιαυτῷ πρότερον (cf. πρὸ τριῶν ἐτῶν in F 127). The extract, brief and 5 corrupt as it is, does not yield anything for Ph. except that he probably followed Thukydides here, too, allotting his narrative to archon's years. It may, however, appear remarkable that he says Βρασιδάς ἀποστῆναι Σκιωναίους, a wording probably not to be understood as a simple statement of fact but in the sense of παρασπονδεῖν in F 124, which possibly 10 belongs together with F 129<sup>2</sup>).

(130) The fact of a campaign to Euboea in the year of Isarchos must of course not be doubted<sup>1</sup>). We do not know any particulars, but it is self-evident that it was not an expedition with the purpose of procuring corn for distribution to the demos<sup>2</sup>).

15 (131) Thukyd. 5, 17, 2 τότε δὴ παρακαλέσαντες τοὺς ἑαυτῶν ξυμμάχους οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, καὶ ψηφισαμένων πλὴν Βοιωτῶν καὶ Κορινθίων καὶ Ἡλείων καὶ Μεγαρέων τῶν ἄλλων ὥστε καταλύεσθαι (τούτοις δὲ οὐκ ἤρρεσκε τὰ πρᾶσσόμενα), ποιοῦνται τὴν ξύμβασιν κτλ. 1). We cannot tell whether the Megarians at the end of the enumeration dropped out in the Mss., or 20 whether Ph. gave details about them which the scholiast did not copy. The scholia on v. 481/3, where one might expect them, fail us; the poet himself οὐδ' οἱ Μεγαρῆς δρῶσ' οὐδέν, ἔλκουσιν δ' ὅμως κτλ. (though he differentiates between them and the quite refractory Boeotians and Argives) does not help either. It is regrettable that most of these quotations are too brief (or too much abridged) for yielding anything in regard 25 either to Ph. or to history.

(132) In the Venetus, which Siebelis and Mueller follow, the subject is lacking, and the supplement Ἀθηναίους is neither self-evident nor even probable. In the Ravennas the Corinthians are the subject, and the 30 statement then may refer to the so-called Argive coalition the driving force of which were the Corinthians. Cf. Thukyd. 5, 27 ἐπειδὴ γὰρ αἱ πενηκοντούταις σπονδαὶ ἐγένοντο καὶ ὕστερον ἢ ξυμμαχία, καὶ αἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Πελοποννήσου πρεσβείαι . . . ἀνεχώρου ἐκ τῆς Λακεδαίμονος · καὶ οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι ἐπ' οἴκου ἀπῆλθον, Κορίνθιοι δὲ ἐς Ἄργος τραπόμενοι πρῶτον λόγους ποιοῦνται 35 πρὸς τινὰς τῶν ἐν τέλει ὄντων Ἀργείων κτλ.

(133-134) *Vit. X Or.* p. 834 D Κορινθίων εἰσπεμφάντων <ἀνδρας διὰ> Λεοντίνους τε καὶ Αἰγεσταίους [ἀνδρας ἰδίαι], <οἱ> μελλόντων βοηθεῖν αὐτοῖς τῶν Ἀθηναίων, νύκτωρ τοὺς περὶ τὴν ἀγορὰν Ἑρμᾶς περιέκοψαν, ὡς Κράτιππος (64 F 3) φησιν. Plutarch. *Alkid.* 18, 7 ἐλέχθη μὲν οὖν ὅτι Κορίνθιοι διὰ τοὺς

Συρακουσίους ἀποίκους ὄντας, ὡς ἐπισχέσεως ἐσομένης πρὸς τὸν οἰωνὸν ἢ μεταγνώσεως τοῦ πολέμου, ταῦτα δράσειαν. (8) οὐ μὴν ἤπτετο γε τῶν πολλῶν οὐθ' οὗτος ὁ λόγος οὐθ' ὁ τῶν σημείων δεινὸν εἶναι μηδὲν οἰομένων, ἀλλ' οἷα φιλεῖ φέρειν ἄκρατος ἀκολάστων νέων εἰς ὕβριν ἐκ παιδιᾶς ὑποφερομένων, 5 ὄργῃ δ' ἅμα καὶ φόβῳ τὸ γεγονός λαμβάνοντες ὡς ἀπὸ συνωμοσίας ἐπὶ πράγμασι μεγάλοις τετολημμένον κτλ. Phot. Lex. s.v. 'Ερμοκοπίδαι · οἱ τῶν 'Ερμῶν τοὺς τραχήλους καὶ τὰ αἰδοῖα ἀποκόψαντες · φασὶ δὲ 'Αλκιβιάδην συμπράττοντα Κορινθίους τοῦτο πράξει<sup>1)</sup>). Thukyd. 6, 60 ὡν ἐνθυμούμενος ὁ δῆμος ὁ τῶν 'Αθηναίων . . . πάντα αὐτοῖς ἐδόκει ἐπὶ ξυνωμοσίαι ὀλιγαρχικῆ καὶ τυραννικῆ πεπραχθαι. (2) . . . ἐνταῦθα ἀναπέιθεται εἰς τῶν δεδεμένων, ὅσπερ ἐδόκει αἰτιώτατος εἶναι, ὑπὸ τῶν ξυνδεσμοτῶν τινὸς<sup>2)</sup> εἶτε ἄρα καὶ τὰ ὄντα μηνῦσαι εἶτε καὶ οὐ · ἐπ' ἀμφοτέρα γὰρ εἰκάζεται, τὸ δὲ σαφὲς οὐδεὶς οὔτε τότε οὔτε ὕστερον ἔχει εἰπεῖν περὶ τῶν δρασάντων τὸ ἔργον. . . . (4) καὶ ὁ μὲν αὐτὸς τε καθ' ἑαυτοῦ καὶ κατ' ἄλλων μηνύει τὸ τῶν 'Ερμῶν<sup>3)</sup>, ὁ δὲ δῆμος ὁ τῶν 'Αθηναίων . . . τὸν μὲν μηνυτὴν εὐθύς καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους μετ' αὐτοῦ ὄσων μὴ κατηγορήκει ἔλυσαν, τοὺς δὲ καταιτιαθέντας κρίσεις ποιήσαντες τοὺς μὲν ἀπέκτειναν ὅσοι ξυνελήφθησαν, τῶν δὲ διαφυγόντων θάνατον καταγρόντες ἐπανεῖπον ἀργύριον τῷ ἀποκτείναντι<sup>4)</sup>. The succinct scholion ascribes to Thukydides a view which that author does not give as his own but as 20 the assertion of the μάλιστα τῷ 'Αλκιβιάδῃ ἀχθόμενοι, and which he himself evidently does not believe<sup>5)</sup>. It is, therefore, not his only explanation: in a manner unusual in him<sup>6)</sup> and repeatedly emphasizing that the question about the author of the offence has remained unsolved in spite of the confession made by one of the arrested 'oligarchs' and his accusation of others<sup>7)</sup>, he touches upon the several opinions about this affair which deeply disturbed the people: τοῦ τε γὰρ ἔκπλου οἰωνὸς ἐδόκει εἶναι καὶ ἐπὶ ξυνωμοσίαι ἅμα νεωτέρων πραγμάτων καὶ δήμου καταλύσεως γεγενῆσθαι. μηνύεται οὖν ἀπὸ μετοίκων τῶν καὶ ἀκολούθων περὶ μὲν τῶν 'Ερμῶν οὐδέν, ἄλλων δὲ ἀγαλμάτων περικοπαί τινες πρότερον ὑπὸ νεωτέρων μετὰ 30 παιδιᾶς καὶ οἴνου γεγενημέναι, καὶ τὰ μυστήρια ἅμα ὡς ποιεῖται ἐν οἰκίαις ἐφ' ὕβρει, ὡν καὶ τὸν 'Αλκιβιάδην ἐπιτιτῶντο, facts used by the enemies of Alkibiades for laying the outrage on the herms also at his door ἐπιλέγοντες τεκμήρια τὴν ἄλλην αὐτοῦ ἐς τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα οὐ δημοτικὴν παρανομίαν<sup>8)</sup>. Even if we regard the indictment of the Corinthians as being the considered opinion of Ph. <sup>9)</sup>, we may suppose therefore that he dealt with the affair in detail, enumerating (as probably all his predecessors did<sup>10)</sup>) the several favourable and unfavourable omens and the several interpretations of the same omen. The μάντις and ἱεροσκόπος may have been particularly (as it were professionally) interested in the opinions of the

'priests and prophets' contradicting each other <sup>11</sup>). The fact that finally he blamed the Corinthians, who are not mentioned in Thukydides, is no proof that Thukydides did not know this version. The contrary would be more probable, for it is obvious that Thukydides knew more than he
 5 said in the sixth book <sup>12</sup>), but did not feel bound to mention all conjectures on both sides in a matter which (as he states repeatedly) was not cleared up οὔτε τότε οὔτε ὕστερον. Presumably the greater number of the stories (as e.g. the nearest parallel, the damaging of the palm at Delphi <sup>13</sup>)) are contemporary in the wider sense which includes the trials after the war (the
 10 case of Andokides and others like it), while later inventions seem to be confined to matters of secondary importance <sup>14</sup>). Historically it does not matter much whether the indictment of the Corinthians was contemporary or a later embellishment, a rather obvious combination which was hardly made by Ph. Anyhow, it remains a mere surmise, and in view of the
 15 facts of the case as well as of the emphatic statement of Thukydides the surmise has (at least in my opinion) an extremely poor chance of being right <sup>15</sup>). μόνον . . . τὴν Ἀνδοκίδου Ἐρμῆν] There is hardly any doubt that φησὶν continues the excerpt from Ph. The fact is attested by Andokides who (in I, 62) explains why ὁ Ἐρμῆς δὴν ὄρατε πάντες, ὁ παρὰ τὴν πατρώϊαν
 20 οἰκίαν τὴν ἡμετέραν, δὴν ἡ Αἰγίης ἀνέθηκεν, οὐ περιεκόπη μόνος τῶν Ἐρμῶν τῶν Ἀθήγησιν, and probably by Ephoros, from whom Plutarch (*Nikias* 13, 3 ἦ τε τῶν Ἐρμῶν περικοπή μιᾷ νυκτὶ πάντων ἀκρωθηριασθέντων πλὴν ἑνὸς δὴν Ἀνδοκίδου καλοῦσιν) and Nepos *Alkib.* 3, 2 derive (Diod. 13, 2, 3 omitted this detail). Thukyd. 6, 27, 1 says μιᾷ νυκτὶ οἱ πλεῖστοι, and he is
 25 followed by Plutarch *Alkib.* 18, 6; but ch. 21, 3 shows that his source is more fully informed. Also Thuk. 6, 27, 1 speaks (somewhat sweepingly?) of ὅσοι Ἐρμαῖ ἦσαν λίθινοι ἐν τῇ πόλει, while Kratippos (64 F 3) confines the outrage to the περὶ τὴν ἀγορὰν Ἐρμαῖ, evidently those whom Plutarch calls ἐπιφανεῖς. ἐπὶ Χαβρίου] This
 30 date accords well with the report of Thukydides. The fleet sailed θέρους μεσοῦντος ἤδη (6, 30, 1), probably in the middle of June 415 B.C. <sup>16</sup>), and while they were on their way the judicial inquiry τῶν περὶ τὰ μυστήρια καὶ τῶν περὶ τὰς Ἐρμαῖς δρασθέντων continued (6, 53, 2) until the confession of Andokides ended the business of the Hermai and
 35 provided the possibility of a fresh attack on Alkibiades: καὶ ἐπειδὴ τὸ τῶν Ἐρμῶν ὄϊοντο σαφές ἔχειν, πολὺ δὴ μᾶλλον καὶ τὰ μυστικά, ὧν ἐπαίτιος ἦν, μετὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ λόγου καὶ τῆς ξυνωμοσίας ἐπὶ τῷ δήμῳ ἀπ' ἐκείνου ἐδόκειπραχθῆναι (6, 61, 1). Accordingly F 133 belongs to the preceding year 416/5 B.C.: Hesych. s.v. Ἐρμοκοπίδαι supplies the archon Ari-

mnestos, whom he probably took from the scholia on Aristophanes, where we should find the name if the scholion on *Lysistrate* 1094 had not been abridged so severely.

It is doubtful whether Ph. gave the decree about the Hermokopidai 5 verbatim, for Melanthios 326 F 3 gave that concerning the proscription of Diagoras from the same year 415/4 B.C. not in the *Atthis* but in the book about Eleusis<sup>17</sup>). But he certainly enumerated the names of those who were executed or proscribed, though we cannot tell whether he called them 'Ερμοκοπίδαι<sup>18</sup>). He did not mention the son of Peisias<sup>19</sup>); it is a 10 mere surmise of some author of *Κωμωιδούμενοι* that this man was perhaps among the Hermokopidai, and almost certainly a wrong one.

(135) Thukyd. 7, 50, 4 και μελλόντων αὐτῶν ἐπειδὴ ἐτοῖμα ἦν ἀποπλεῖν, ἡ 5 σελήνη ἐκλείπει . . . και ὁ Νικίας (ἦν γάρ τι και ἄγαν θειασμῶι τε και τῶι τοιούτῳι προσκείμενος) οὐδ' ἂν διαβουλεύσασθαι ἐτι ἔφη πρὶν, ὡς οἱ μαντεῖς 15 ἐξηγοῦντο, τρεῖς ἐννέα ἡμέρας μείναι, ὅπως ἂν πρότερον κινηθεῖη. και τοῖς μὲν Ἀθηναίους μελλήσασι διὰ τοῦτο ἡ μονὴ ἐγεγένητο. Diod. 13, 12, 6 μελλόντων δ' αὐτῶν τῆι ὕστεραιαι πλεῖν, ἐξέλιπεν ἡ σελήνη . . . . διόπερ ὁ Νικίας, και φύσει δεισιδαίμων ὑπάρχων και διὰ τὴν ἐν τῶι στρατοπέδῳι νόσον 20 εὐλαβῶς διακείμενος, συνεκάλεσε τοὺς μάντεις. τούτων δ' ἀποφνημαμένον ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι τὰς εἰθισμένας τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναβαλέσθαι τὸν ἐκπλοῦν κτλ.

Ph. is quoted because of his correct interpretation of the σημεῖον. This interpretation by an expert directly contradicts that which Nikias at the time received from his diviners (left anonymous also by Ph.?) and which proved so fatal for the Athenian army; Ph. consequently regarded as the 25 reason of the catastrophe the untimely death of Stilbides which deprived the commander of his μάντις ἔμπειρος. The question whether Ph. called Stilbides a συνήθης of Nikias or the like may remain open, but the characterisation τὸ πολὺ τῆς δεισιδαιμονίας ἀφαιρῶν does not come from him but from Plutarch who, apropos of the distinction between ἀπειρία 30 and δεισιδαιμονία, expounds in a digression of some length that the scientific explanation of the phenomenon was little known at the time. The slight vagueness thus arising does not affect the understanding of F 135 b, which we must not ascribe to *Περὶ μαντικῆς*: the interpretation of the omen belongs to the narrative<sup>1)</sup>). Its difference from that of Thukydides is obvious: the latter gives the same facts, the tragic consequences of which he states succinctly without entering into speculations about the 'correct' interpretation and what might have happened if Stilbides had still been alive; as he does not believe in divination he is not interested in this point. The reverse was the case with Ph., and we need not doubt

that the exegesis of Nikias' diviners was ardently discussed in the Athens of Lampon. As Ph. declares the omen to be plainly favourable for a fleeing army it does not seem probable that he dealt with the 'period of incubation'; the 'three days' of Autokleides (353 F 7) were not derived 5 from Ph. The figures of Diodoros should not be altered; Ephoros deliberately corrected in this point the report of Thukydides which distinctly shines through in Diodoros<sup>2</sup>).

(136) See commentary on Androtrion 324 F 43.

(137) The difficulties are these: (1) Marcellinus does not give the name 10 of the archon under whom two reliable authors entered a 'return of the, or of, exiles'; (2) the phrase *κάθοδος ἐδόθη* does not imply with absolute certainty that the return took place on the strength of a (special) resolution of the people. It is a well known fact that the peace of 404 B.C. imposed on the Athenians the duty to allow the return of their exiles<sup>1</sup>), 15 but that is not *κάθοδον δίδοναι* either as to the matter, or probably formally<sup>2</sup>). The text expressly states *μετὰ τὴν ἤτταν τὴν ἐν Σικελίαι, i.e.* in 413/2 B.C., and it is difficult to conceive that or why anybody should have interpolated the modification *τὴν ἐν Σικελίαι* in this *Vita* and in 20 this context. On the other hand, the words which Krueger deleted present two difficulties, different in their nature: (1) it is not easy to believe that Didymos assigned the death of Thukydides already to the following year 412/1 B.C. (for though he does not state how long after his return Thukydides was murdered, he evidently does not assume a great interval between the two events). The reason for this dating could only be that 25 Thukydides' work breaks off with the year 411 B.C.; but it contains passages referring to the year 404, which can hardly have escaped the scholar's notice. It is true that this argument is of no great value; both scholars and historians have at any time drawn conclusions in defiance of facts, whether they overlooked them or because they did not suit their 30 preconceived ideas. Further we should think that Didymos must have known a particular decree passed in regard to Thukydides<sup>3</sup>), though it may be doubted whether he was able to date it, if he did not find it in one of the *Atthides* which he used to consult. Actually it is possible that the decree of Oinobios was passed not long after the defeat in Sicily<sup>4</sup>), and 35 Didymos (if he knew that) might have regarded that as a corroboration of his early date for Thukydides' death. We had better leave aside the further rather obvious possibility that the biographer unduly compressed a learned argument of Didymos<sup>5</sup>); it would take the ground from under our feet, and would not remove the express statement that 'after the



Sicilian defeat the exiled were allowed to return'. (2) Thukyd. 8, 1 does not mention a decree of the kind. But other facts are lacking in his succinct narrative, and he does say that the Athenians *χαλεποί μὲν ἦσαν τοῖς ζυμπροθυμηθεῖσι τῶν ῥητόρων τὸν ἔκπλουον*, and that they voted *ἀρχὴν τινα πρεσβυτέρων ἀνδρῶν ἐλέσθαι οἵτινες περὶ τῶν παρόντων ὡς ἂν καιρὸς ἦι προβουλεύσουσιν*. A decree to bring together all the resources of the State in this way also by reconciling the parties and at the same time to forestall the menace of the exiles joining hands with the enemy of the country is in accord with the situation at the time, nor are there lacking 10 parallels more or less near <sup>6</sup>). On the other hand, the decree seems to be attested by Thukyd. 8, 70, 1: the Four Hundred *ὕστερον δὲ πολὺ μεταλλάξαντες τῆς τοῦ δήμου διοικήσεως (πλὴν τοὺς φεύγοντας οὐ κατήγον τοῦ Ἀλκιβιάδου ἕνεκα) τά τε ἄλλα ἐνεμον κατὰ κράτος τὴν πόλιν*. Later additional remarks of this kind are not infrequent in Thukydides <sup>7</sup>), and 15 the idea that the return of the exiles could not have been voted 'by the Demos' <sup>8</sup>) seems to be hyperlogical. If the decree was passed it benefited the 'oligarchs'; that was the idea if the parties were to be reconciled, and the only question needing an answer is why the Four Hundred did not carry it into effect. Thukydides provides the answer by the words *Ἀλκιβιάδου ἕνεκα*. If later we read in 8, 97, 3 that immediately after the overthrow of the Four Hundred *ἐψηφίσαντο δὲ καὶ Ἀλκιβιάδην καὶ ἄλλους μετ' αὐτοῦ κατιέναι* we might infer that the whole action had Alkibiades in view from the first. That we do not hear about it otherwise is quite intelligible: the Four Hundred did not carry out the first decree; the second 25 was narrower, for it concerned not all *φυγάδες* but only Alkibiades and an indefinite number of others (*ἄλλους*, not *τοὺς ἄλλους*), and even Alkibiades made use of the permission not until 408 B.C. In these circumstances we are hardly justified in refusing to credit <sup>9</sup>) the statement handed down under the names of Demetrios and Ph. that *μετὰ τὴν ἦτταν 30 τὴν ἐν Σικελίαι κάθοδος ἐδόθη τοῖς φεύγουσιν*, assuming an interpolation which would be anyhow difficult to explain.

(138) Thukyd. 8, 15, 1 *ἐς δὲ τὰς Ἀθήνας ταχὺ ἀγγελία τῆς Χίου ἀφικνεῖται · καὶ νομίσαντες μέγαν ἤδη καὶ σαφῆ τὸν κίνδυνον σφᾶς περιεστάναι . . . τά τε χίλια τάλαντα, ὧν διὰ παντὸς τοῦ πολέμου ἐγλίχοντο μὴ ἄψασθαι, εὐθὺς ἔλυσαν τὰς ἐπικειμένους ζημίας τῶι εἰπόντι ἢ ἐπιψηφίσαντι ὑπὸ τῆς 35 παρούσης ἐκπλήξεως, καὶ ἐψηφίσαντο κινεῖν*. The decree of 431 B.C. about a reserve-fund Thukyd. 2, 24, 1 recorded in detail: *καὶ χίλια τάλαντα ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει χρημάτων ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς ἐξαιρέτα ποιησαμένοις χωρὶς θέσθαι καὶ μὴ ἀναλοῦν, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων πολεμεῖν · ἦν δὲ τις εἵπηι ἢ ἐπι-*

ψηφίση κινεῖν τὰ χρήματα ταῦτα ἐς ἄλλο τι, ἢν μὴ οἱ πολέμιοι νηίτη στρατῶν ἐπιπλέωσι τῇ πόλει καὶ δέη ἀμύνασθαι, θανατὸν ζημίαν ἐπέθεντο. If Thukydides did not mention the fund in 8, 1<sup>1</sup>) this certainly was not done because he had forgotten it: ἀμα δὲ ναῦς οὐχ ὄρωντες ἐν τοῖς νεωσοίκους 5 ἱκανὰς οὐδὲ χρήματα ἐν τῷ κοινῷ οὐδ' ὑπηρεσίας ταῖς ναυσὶν ἀνέλπιστοι ἦσαν ἐν τῷ παρόντι σωθήσεσθαι.

(139) Diodor. 13, 52, 2 (wrongly under the year 410/9 B.C.) οἱ δὲ Λακεδαιμόνιοι ὡς ἤκουσαν τὴν περὶ Κύζικον αὐτοῖς γενομένην συμφορὰν, πρέσβεις ἐξέπεμψαν εἰς Ἀθήνας ὑπὲρ εἰρήνης, ὧν ἦν ἀρχιπρεσβευτὴς Ἐνδιος<sup>1</sup>) . . . 10 (53, 1) τοιαῦτα δὲ . . . τοῦ Λάκωνος διαλεχθέντος οἱ μὲν ἐπιεικέστατοι τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἔρρεπον ταῖς γνώμαις πρὸς τὴν εἰρήνην, οἱ δὲ πολεμοποιοῖεν εἰσθότες καὶ τὰς δημοσίας παραχὰς ἰδίας παιούμενοι προσόδους ἠιροῦντο τὸν πόλεμον. (2) συνεπελάβετο δὲ τῆς γνώμης ταύτης καὶ Κλεοφῶν, μέγιστος ὧν τότε δημαγωγός κτλ. According to F 139 b Ph. has touched upon the role of 15 Kleophon, probably in the manner of F 128, where he says Κλέωνος δ' ἀντιπόντος ταῖς διαλύσεσι. In the former case it appeared impossible that Ph. painted the same lurid picture which others gave of Kleon's conduct; here, the extract being so brief, it is possible though perhaps not probable. The *Atthis*, even if biassed politically, seems to have avoided the tone of 20 the pamphleteers, and Aristotle's description of Kleophon<sup>2</sup>) does not seem to derive from Androtion who most probably would not have given it as late as 406/5 B.C. We might even ask whether the Spartans did offer peace once more after the Arginusai battle<sup>3</sup>) (if they did the conditions were hardly the same as in 411/0 B.C.). But about the offer 25 which Ph. reports still under the archon Theopompos<sup>4</sup>) no doubt is possible.

(140) After the victory of Kyzikos (and in connexion with the rejection of the Spartan peace-offer F 139?) the moderate constitution of the Five Thousand, which met with the approval of Thukydides (8, 97) 30 and Aristotle (*Ἀθπ.* 33, 2) again leaves the field to pure democracy. The year 410/9 B.C. is the first of the new order<sup>1</sup>) in which the authority of the Boule presumably became extremely limited. The new distribution of the seats in it, directly attested by Ph. alone<sup>2</sup>), is of psychological interest: as it is impossible (though one has tried to do in our times) to 35 forbid the sharing of political convictions, one may at least forbid their demonstrative expression by sitting together in the legislative bodies of partisans. The Council at least is no longer allowed to do what Thukydides, son of Melesias, had introduced in the Assembly almost fifty years before: οὐ γὰρ εἶπασε τοὺς καλοὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς καλουμένους ἀνδρας ἐνδισπάρθαι

καὶ συμμεμεῖχθαι πρὸς τὸν δῆμον ὡς πρότερον, ὑπὸ πλήθους ἡμαυρωμέ-  
 νους τὸ ἀξίωμα, χωρὶς δὲ διακρίνας καὶ συναγαγὼν εἰς ταῦτ' τὴν πάντων δύ-  
 ναμιν ἐμβριθῆ γενομένην ὥσπερ ἐπὶ ζυγοῦ ῥοπήν ἐποίησεν <sup>2)</sup>. The fact that  
 this prohibition was included in the oath taken by the councillors proves  
 5 the importance attached to it: events in the Assembly since the esta-  
 blishment of the probouloi <sup>4)</sup> must have shown the people that the  
 sitting together of political sympathizers was not a mere formality.

(141) It is evident that Ph. added to the general statement of Hella-  
 nikos about coinage of gold in 407/6 B.C. (always a measure of emergency  
 10 in Hellas proper) from his special information about the administration  
 of the temple property <sup>1)</sup>. The passage of Aristophanes presents diffi-  
 culties: if he compares 'old money' and 'new gold', praising (vv. 721/4)  
 the purity and beauty of the former which was willingly accepted every-  
 where by Greeks and barbarians, *τούτοισιν* in v. 721 cannot refer to both  
 15 the old silver tetradrachms and the new golden coins <sup>2)</sup>; on the contrary,  
 the latter are belittled in vv. 725/6 while the former are praised: *ἀλλὰ*  
*τούτοις τοῖς πονηροῖς χαλκίοις / χθές τε καὶ πρόην κοπεῖσι τῶι κακίστῳ*  
*κόμματι* refers to the gold coins as the scholia correctly interpret by *ῥῶν δὲ*  
*ὡς κακῶν τὸ χρυσοῦν οὕτως εἶπεν*. The suggestion of Boeckh <sup>3)</sup> that the  
 20 gold coins were really bad because the gold had been inordinately alloyed  
 with copper is contradicted by the preserved gold coins <sup>4)</sup>. But the poet  
 was not obliged to consider this point, not being concerned with numis-  
 matical accuracy. The possibility that the memory of the bronze tetra-  
 drachms coined in 406/5 B.C. (the year of the *Ranae*) unintentionally  
 25 intruded and influenced his formulation seems excluded by the context  
 which leaves no doubt that the contrast of old and new is exclusively  
 that of silver and gold. Therefore the second interpretation suggested by  
 that of silver and gold. Therefore the second interpretation suggested by  
 the scholia — *δύναιτο δ' ἂν καὶ τὸ χαλκοῦν λέγειν, ἐπὶ γὰρ Καλλίου (406/5*  
*B.C.) χαλκοῦν νόμισμα ἐκόπη* — seems wrong. Nevertheless, as they cer-  
 30 tainly found this fact, too, in Ph., I have admitted the words among the  
 fragments. The bronze tetradrachms remained in use until 394/3 B.C.;  
 then *ἀνέκραγ'* ὁ κῆρυξ μὴ δέχεσθαι μηδένα / χαλκοῦν τὸ λοιπόν, 'ἀργύρωι  
 γὰρ χρώμεθα' <sup>5)</sup>.

(142) Xenoph. *Hell.* 1, 7, 1 οἱ δ' ἐν οἴκῳ τούτους μὲν τοὺς στρατηγούς  
 35 ἔπαυσαν πλὴν Κόνωνος . . . (2) τῶν δὲ ναυμαχησάντων στρατηγῶν Πρωτόμα-  
 χος μὲν καὶ Ἀριστογένης οὐκ ἀπῆλθον εἰς Ἀθήνας, τῶν δὲ ἐξ καταπλευσάντων,  
 Περικλέους καὶ Διομέδοντος καὶ Λυσίου καὶ Ἀριστοκράτους καὶ Θρασύλλου καὶ  
 Ἐρασινίδου, Ἀρχέδημος δὲ τοῦ δήμου τότε προσετηκῶς ἐν Ἀθήναις καὶ τῆς δι-  
 ωβελίας ἐπιμελόμενος Ἐρασινίδῃ ἐπιβολὴν ἐπιβαλὼν κατηγορεῖ ἐν δικαστηρίῳ,

φάσκων ἐξ Ἐλλησπόντου αὐτὸν ἔχειν χρήματα ὄντα τοῦ δήμου · κατηγορεῖ δὲ καὶ περὶ τῆς στρατηγίας, καὶ ἔδοξε τῷ δικαστηρίῳ δῆσαι τὸν Ἐρασινίδην. (3) μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἐν τῇ βουλῇ διηγοῦντο οἱ στρατηγοὶ περὶ τε τῆς ναυμαχίας καὶ τοῦ μεγέθους τοῦ χειμῶνος. Τιμοκράτους δ' εἰπόντος ὅτι καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους χρήματα δεθέντας εἰς τὸν δῆμον παραδοθῆναι, ἡ βουλὴ ἔδρασε. (4) μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἐκκλησία ἐγένετο, ἐν ἣι τῶν στρατηγῶν κατηγοροῦν ἄλλοι τε καὶ Θηραμένης μάλιστα, δίκαιους εἶναι λόγον ὑποσχεῖν διότι οὐκ ἀνείλοντο τοὺς ναυαγούς . . . . (34) καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα κατεψηφίσαντο τῶν ναυμαχισάντων στρατηγῶν ὅκτῳ ὄντων, ἀπέθανον δὲ οἱ παρόντες ἕξ. Diodor. 13, 101, 5  
 10 διόπερ ὁ δῆμος προσέθηεν αὐτοῖς κρίσιν, καὶ Κόνωνα μὲν ἀπολύσας τῆς αἰτίας προσέταξε τούτῳ τὰς δυνάμεις παραδίδοσθαι, τοὺς δ' ἄλλους ἐψηφίσαστο τὴν ταχίστην ἔρκειν · ὦν Ἀριστογένης μὲν καὶ Πρωτόμαχος φοβηθέντες τὴν ὀργὴν τοῦ πλήθους ἔφυγον, Θράσυλλος δὲ καὶ † Καλλιᾶδης, ἔτι δὲ Λυσίας καὶ Περικλῆς καὶ Ἀριστοκράτης μετὰ τῶν πλείστων νεῶν κατέπλευσαν εἰς τὰς  
 15 Ἀθήνας . . . . (6) ὡς δ' εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τὰ πλήθη . . . συνῆλθον . . . . (7) . . . συνέβη καταδικασθῆναι τοὺς στρατηγούς θανάτῳ καὶ δημεῦσαι τῶν οὐσιῶν.

The names are the same in Xenophon and Ph. 1); in Diodoros Καλλιᾶδης probably is a corruption of Ἐρασινίδης; Diomedon did not drop out, but was saved up for ch. 102: μελλόντων αὐτῶν ὑπὸ τῶν δημοσίων ἐπὶ τὸν θάνατον  
 20 ἀγεσθαι, Διομέδων εἰς τῶν στρατηγῶν παρῆλθεν εἰς τὸ μέσον, ἀνὴρ καὶ τὰ περὶ τὸν πόλεμον ἔμπρακτος καὶ δικαιοσύνη τε καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις ἀρεταῖς δοκῶν διαφέρειν κτλ. We are not informed what happened about the special charge against Erasinides, and it is easy to understand why: Ph., who reported less fully, evidently did not mention him. Demetrios 2) presumably took  
 25 his information from Xenophon directly or indirectly.

(143) The relation between the first *Plutos* of 409/8 B.C. and the second, which was performed 21 years later, *i.e.* in 389/8 1), need not concern us here 2). The Scholiast, who takes the play with which he is dealing to be the first *Plutos*, felt a chronological difficulty which (otherwise than  
 30 in F 123) he believed himself able to solve by assuming an interpolation from the second *Plutos*. For the time of the event to which the poet alludes he consulted Ph., according to his custom, counting (again according to his custom) the interval from the performance of the first *Plutos* exclusively 3). Surprising only that he calculates from the death  
 35 of Kritias in the last months of 404/3 B.C. (which, it is true, was the immediate cause for the removal of the Thirty and preceded it immediately 4)) instead of from the conquest of Phyle in the beginning of winter 404/3 5) or from the amnesty which belongs to the first months of the year of Eukleides 403/2 B.C. 6). The quotation from the historical source (usually

cited with a good deal of detail by Didymos) seems to have been severely abbreviated in our Scholia.

(144-146) This passage of Didymos' commentary belongs to the same context as F 149 and F 151. In order to ascertain the reference of Demosthenes' argument for working hand in hand with the Persian King <sup>1</sup>), δς καὶ πρότερον συνεπηνώρθωσε τὰ τῆς πόλεως πράγματα, Didymos looked up his main author Ph., who treated the first four decades of the fourth century in his fifth book <sup>2</sup>). Accordingly he states that the εἰρήνη ἦν ἐπὶ Ἀντιαλκίδου κατέπεμψεν βασιλεύς of 392/1 B.C. (F 149) cannot be meant because the Athenians had rejected it; the peace of 375/4 B.C. might be considered, ἦν ἀσμένως προσήκοντο οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι (F 151), but other events as well as e.g. ἡ ὑπὸ Καλλίου τοῦ Ἰππονίκου πρυτανευθεῖσα εἰρήνη and several χρημάτων ἐπιδόσεις <sup>3</sup>). Eventually Didymos arrives at the decision (καὶ πάνυ πιθανόν) that the words do not refer to a peace at all but to the assistance given to Konon, which made possible both the naval victory at Knidos in 394/3 B.C. and the rebuilding of the Long Walls. The facts about the naval war he takes from Ph., starting with its beginning in the year of Suniades 397/6 B.C., and this date is the most important, and almost the only certain item we obtain from the badly preserved record. From the opening προθεῖς ἄρχοντα Σουινιάδην Ἀχαρνέα we expect a verbatim extract. If this is true (the almost complete destruction of vv. 36/9 does not permit of full security) the lines 48/51, in which the succinct style of the chronicle is clearly to be perceived, no longer belong to this excerpt, but to another about the events of 394/3 B.C., to which F 146 (vv. 51 ff.) also belongs. It is quite intelligible that Didymos took from Ph. both the date of the beginning of the naval war and that of its end, the decisive victory at Knidos. Unfortunately it is not possible to state where the first excerpt ends and the second begins; the supplement ἐπ' Εὐβουλίδου (394/3 B.C.) at the end of l. 39 is untenable after Croenert's revision of the papyrus. I have therefore given two numbers to the fragment which contains events of the years 397/6 and 394/3 B.C., for even when assuming the most succinct narrative, it seems impossible that 15 lines should be all Ph. had to say about the years 397/6-394/3. It is, in my opinion, a wrong suggestion that Ph. 'interrupted here the annalistic arrangement', recording under one archon the share of Konon in the events of four years <sup>4</sup>). The form Foucart gives to this suggestion and his praise of Ph. <sup>5</sup>) seem to me rather ill-considered, for they eliminate the principle of annalistic arrangement altogether. Σουινιάδην Ἀχαρνέα] The supplement of the name, the

Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.)

- reading of which is by no means certain, is determined by the demotikon, for Εὐβουλιδης, who alone could compete, is Eleusinian <sup>6</sup>). Since the words Κόνων and Κύπρος (ἀπὸ Κύπρου seems the only possible supplement) are almost certain we shall compare Diodoros <sup>7</sup>) and (neglecting his 5 chronology) assume that Ph. dated the beginning of the naval war in 397/6 B.C. It is regrettable that the forty ships with which Konon opened the war according to Diodoros, are lacking in the papyrus <sup>8</sup>); the number would finally guarantee the interpretation. Whether Ph. reported the appointment of Konon as Persian admiral, and whether this fact 10 was mentioned already under the year 398/7 B.C. we cannot tell, and those who maintain that Ph. could not have been accurately informed about the dates of the events in Asia cannot be strictly refuted: we do not know his sources for this period, but there seems no doubt that the year 399/8 B.C. given by Diodoros is too early <sup>9</sup>). Λώρυμα κτλ.]
- 15 Xenoph. *Hell.* 4, 3, 10-12 καὶ ἠγγέλθη ὅτι ἡττημένοι εἶεν οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι τῇ ναυμαχίᾳ καὶ ὁ ναύαρχος Πείσανδρος τεθναίη, ἐλέγγοτο δὲ καὶ ὡς τρόπῳ ἢ ναυμαχία ἐγένετο κτλ. Diod. 14, 83, 4-7 Κόνων δὲ ὁ Ἀθηναῖος καὶ Φαρνάβαζος . . . διέτριβον . . . περὶ Λώρυμα (Ortel Δω- ο) τῆς Χερρονήσου, τριήρεις ἔχοντες πλείους τῶν ἐνεήκοντα . . . Πείσανδρος (ν περιάρχος ο) δ' ὁ 20 τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων ναύαρχος ἐξέπλευσεν ἐκ τῆς Κνίδου τριήρεσιν ὀγδοήκοντα πέντε, καὶ κατηνέχθη πρὸς Φύσκον τῆς Χερρονήσου . . . οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Κόνωνα . . . πενήκοντα μὲν τριήρων ἐκυρίευσαν, τῶν δ' ἀνδρῶν . . . ἐάλωσαν . . . περὶ πεντακοσίους <sup>10</sup>). For the battle see Swoboda *R. E.* XI, 1922, col. 1326 f. and Beloch *Gr. G.* <sup>3</sup> III 1, 1922, p. 75 ff., for Peisandros 25 Ehrenberg *R. E.* XIX 1, 1937, col. 144 no. 10. τείχη] The rebuilding of the walls began before the battle (F 40), possibly with the help of a χρημάτων ἐπίδοσις by the King or by Konon <sup>11</sup>). When Konon came to Athens in spring 393 B.C. he brought more money from Pharnabazcs for the work to be done and made the men of his fleet help <sup>12</sup>).
- 30 (147) See on Androtrion 324 F 18. The embassy to the King belongs to the game of intrigues against the hegemony of Sparta; it occurred several years before the Corinthian War (F 148).
- (148) The *Ekklesiastusai* was performed in 393/2 B.C. <sup>1</sup>). It is therefore clear that Aristophanes, who mentions Corinth and Argos, refers to the 35 alliance between Athens, Thebes, Corinth, Argos in 395/4 B.C. and the so-called Corinthian War. The alliance between Athens and Boeotia, the evidence for which the Scholia take from Ph., was concluded earlier, but according to *Hell. Ox.* ch. 11-13 also in the Attic year 395/4 B.C. The document of the Συμ[μαχία Βοιω[τῶν καὶ Αθηναίων ἐς τὸν ἀεὶ] χρόνον

IG<sup>2</sup> II 14<sup>a</sup>) is without a date, as the preceding decree is not preserved. The historians did not fail to recognize the importance of the alliance by which the *volle-face* of Athenian policy became manifest<sup>3</sup>), and the contemporary orators mention it frequently and impressively<sup>4</sup>).

- 5 (149) About the context in which this fragment appears in Didymos see on F 144/6. Didymos seems to have excerpted verbatim according to his custom, though he (or the papyrus) probably abridged the text somewhat<sup>1</sup>). In that case F 149 is a good example of how succinctly and how exclusively as a local historian Ph. recorded the events, at least
- 10 in his first six books. He does not relate what led up to the steps which the King took, what considerations determined him, what the condition of the world was; he has subordinated everything happening outside Athens: he gives the contents of the treaty only so far as they regard Athens; he states that the Athenians rejected the peace and that they
- 15 condemned their ambassadors; but he gives the full names of the ambassadors and of the man who brought the charge, he also mentions the detail that they did not dare to appear in court. Nevertheless, with a really admirable technique, he managed to communicate in the subordinate clauses all that his readers must know of the general historical
- 20 facts: the agent who carried the peace-offer to Greece (probably in the form of a letter from the King<sup>2</sup>) ) and that the negotiations took place at Sparta. We can easily fit into this report what we learn from the third speech of Andokides *Περὶ τῆς πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους εἰρήνης*<sup>3</sup>) about the transactions in Sparta and from Demosthenes' *Περὶ τῆς παραπροσβείας*
- 25 about the charge brought against the ambassadors<sup>4</sup>). The value of Ph.'s evidence, which may have been written a century later than the events<sup>5</sup>), becomes obvious when we compare the contemporary tradition, *i.e.* Xenophon *Hell.* 4, 8, 12 ff., and the speech of Andokides in which the orator, himself a member of the embassy, recommends the peace. What
- 30 surprises us in that speech is this: the speaker recommends a peace with Sparta and calls it *κοινὴ εἰρήνη*. Surely he does so because, although it is to be concluded between Sparta on the one side and the quadruple alliance (on F 148) on the other, all Greek states are to be at liberty to join<sup>6</sup>). The attitude taken towards the project of peace by Sparta and
- 35 Athens is set forth distinctly (§ 12 ff.); but we do not learn that the treaty under discussion is an *εἰρήνη ἣν κατέπεμψεν βασιλεύς*, nor is the name of Antialkidas mentioned. This is intelligible; also the evidence of the speech in no point plainly contradicts the report of Ph.<sup>7</sup>) But there does exist a contradiction between the contemporary historian

and the Atthidographer, and an analysis of Xenophon's narrative shows that it does not concern details; it presents the whole affair in an essentially different manner. In consequence of the comprehensive activity displayed by Konon, with the help of Persia, in the interest of Athens and her allies after the battle of Knidos, Sparta sends Antialkidas to Tiribazos, the 'strategos' of the King, *προστάξαντες αὐτῶι ταῦτα διδάσκειν καὶ πειρᾶσθαι εἰρήνην τῆι πόλει ποιεῖσθαι πρὸς βασιλέα* (*Hell.* 4, 8, 12). Tiribazos does not venture to do this on his own responsibility (it will become clear presently why I am skipping to § 16), but gives Antialkidas subsidies and arrests the admiral Konon<sup>8</sup>); subsequently he himself travels to the King in order to report and to ask for instructions<sup>9</sup>). The King refuses to alter Persia's policy towards the Greeks, he replaces Tiribazos by Struthas, who is favourable to Athens, and in consequence of these actions Sparta re-starts the war against Persia by sending Thibron to Asia<sup>10</sup>). This is in itself an entirely clear course of events. But between the negotiations of Antialkidas with Tiribazos (§ 12) and the first measures of the latter against the Athenians (§ 16) the following happens (§ 13-15): the Athenians, having got wind of the mission of Antialkidas, *ἀντιπέμπουσι πρέσβεις μετὰ Κόνωνος Ἐρμογόνη καὶ Δίωνα καὶ Καλλισθένη καὶ Καλλιμέδοντα · συμπαρακέλεσαν δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν συμμάχων πρέσβεις, καὶ παρεγένοντο ἀπὸ τε Βοιωτῶν καὶ Κορίνθου καὶ Ἄργους*. Evidently a joint session takes place in which Antialkidas first explains to Tiribazos that Sparta wished for peace with Persia, offering him such a peace 'as the King had long desired': *τῶν τε γὰρ ἐν τῆι Ἄσισι Ἑλληνίδων πόλεων Λακεδαιμονίους βασιλεῖ οὐκ ἀντιποιεῖσθαι, τὰς τε νῆσους ἀπάσας καὶ τὰς ἄλλας πόλεις ἀρκεῖν σφίσι αὐτονόμους εἶναι*. The ambassadors of the allies protest; Xenophon gives their reasons succinctly and concludes with the formal statement: *αὕτη μὲν ἡ εἰρήνη οὕτως ἐγένετο ἀτελής, καὶ ἀπῆλθον οὐκ ἕκαστος*. The report presents us with a double difficulty, one external, the other internal. (1) The internal difficulty is this: none of the ambassadors from Athens had belonged to the embassy to Sparta; four of them are unknown, or at least they cannot be identified with any degree of certainty or even probability<sup>11</sup>), and the leader Konon provides serious difficulties. We do not see how Konon, who is an active Persian admiral (§ 12; cf. 9 ff.), could at the same time have been the head of the Athenian embassy<sup>12</sup>), nor can it be explained easily how Tiribazos could have arrested him (§ 16) if all ambassadors returned home (§ 15). This difficulty can be solved only by the assumption that Xenophon combined two different traditions: (a) a Spartan report about the mission of



Antialkidas which was to make the attempt at drawing Persia from the side of Athens to that of Sparta by directing the attention of the king to the grave consequences of Konon's activity, and (b) a manifestly anti-Spartan (let us say at once Athenian) account of that mission, according to which Sparta offered the King the Greeks of Asia Minor as the price for a general peace. The connecting link between these two traditions, which Xenophon worked into one, is the person of Konon, who in the Spartan record appears as a Persian admiral and in the Athenian as the leader of the counter-embassy from Athens<sup>13</sup>). (2) The external difficulty consists in a profound and apparently irremovable contradiction between Xenophon's § 13-15 on the one side, and on the other Ph., Andokides, and Demosthenes, which cannot be dismissed with the short remark that 'Xenophon passed over the transactions in Sparta as being unessential'<sup>14</sup>). Xenophon does not simply pass them over, but in his whole account and its formal conclusion they are impossible; and this is valid not only for the 'inserted passage' § 13-15 but also for the primary report § 12; 16-17, in which the King rejects the 'preliminary peace' concluded between Antialkidas and Tiribazos, with the consequence that the war between Sparta and Persia continued. Xenophon mentions no trans- actions in Sparta because there is no *εἰρήνη ἦν ἐπ' Ἀντιαλκίδου κατέπεμψεν βασιλεύς*. The historian has to decide not only between Ph. and Xenophon who alone (but in this passage elaborately) reports about the doings of Antialkidas in Asia, or rather about the attempt to draw Persia from the side of Athens to her own; he must decide also between the Atthidographer and the Athenian source of Xenophon<sup>15</sup>). There cannot very well be a doubt that the decision must be given in favour of Ph.: he seems to be more remote from the events than Xenophon and his contemporary authorities both Spartan and Athenian, but he uses (it does not matter whether directly or through Androtion<sup>16</sup>) documentary tradition, which (as far as it goes) is confirmed by the contemporary Andokides and by Demosthenes. Also (and this is even more important) neither he nor Androtion had, as far as we can see, an axe of his own to grind: that the Athenians, who were quite willing to accept Persian help through their countryman Konon, refused to hand over to the King the Greeks in Asia, is a fact abundantly proved by the rejection of the peace, the condemnation of the ambassadors, and the continuance of both the Corinthian War and that of Sparta with Persia. Their motives do not concern us here, but the generally anti-Persian attitude of the Demos again is a fact<sup>17</sup>); Ph. had no reason for

excusing Athens and for falsifying or modifying facts in her favour. Matters were different for the orator Andokides who was obliged to recommend the conditions of this peace, fatal though they were for the position of Athens as a great power, and who therefore wisely left un-  
 5 mentioned at least its unsavoury antecedents, *viz.* the agreement of Sparta with Persia and the abandonment of the Greeks in Asia <sup>18</sup>). Different again for Xenophon, who confined himself to describing the endeavour of Sparta, legitimate in itself <sup>19</sup>), to put an end to the war with Persia in order to have her hands free for the war in Greece proper.  
 10 In recording this he originally passed over the concession offered by Sparta (or the demand of the King) because it threw an unpleasant light on the policy of Sparta, and in connexion with this fundamentally important point all transactions conducted in Sparta and in Athens in regard to this condition, its acceptance by the Athenian ambassadors in  
 15 Sparta and its rejection by the Athenian Assembly <sup>20</sup>). Finally, matters again were different for the Athenian authority of Xenophon, who was either hostile to Sparta or, speaking against the peace of 387/6 B.C., had the duty to expose the preliminary dealings between Sparta and Persia which Andokides had kept in the dark. It may be a lie (I am not so sure)  
 20 that Sparta made the offer on her own initiative, but this Athenian is not very far from the truth: it was Sparta who appealed to the King as umpire and covered her egotistical policy with the sweet-sounding name *κοινή εἰρήνη* <sup>21</sup>).

It remains to point out the particulars supplied by F 149 a, both those  
 25 confirming the tradition and those correcting it. (1) Andokides had to leave his country for the second time, as stated in *Vit. X Or.* p. 835 A *πεμφθεὶς δὲ περὶ τῆς εἰρήνης εἰς Λακεδαιμόνα καὶ δόξας ἀδικεῖν ἔφυγε*. There was actually no reason for rejecting this information as being 'a combination of little probability <sup>22</sup>'); it was merely unconfirmed, for  
 30 the corroboration by Demosthenes has become possible only since Ph. gave us Epikrates as the leader of the embassy to Sparta; the old quotation of Ph. in F 149 b was such as to rouse suspicions by its simple statement *μὴ πείσαντος Ἀνδοκίδου*. We shall now have to assume (which in itself is a credible assumption) that Ph. noted the unsuccessful re-  
 35 commendation of the peace by Andokides and the rebuff given to the Spartan ambassadors whose presence is attested by Andokid. 3, 39; 41; a brief clause to that effect could easily be placed between *συννενημένους* and *ἀλλὰ καί*, and Didymos may have omitted that sentence as being unessential for his purpose. In any case F 149 b is a warning against

putting too great confidence in the late extracts which as a rule are all that we now have of the earlier learned commentaries. (2) Kirchner *P. A. Add.* 4859 and others recognized at once that Epikrates is the well-known *ρήτωρ και δημαγωγός* whose death-sentence Demosthenes 5 mentioned <sup>23</sup>): *ἐπειδὴ παρὰ τὰ γράμματα ἐπρέσβευσαν ἐκεῖνοι*, as was stated in the decree. We obtain now his demos and may assume that the condemnation in 392/1 B.C. put an end to his political career. Nothing is known about a rehabilitation, and there is no mention of him after 392/1 B.C. The latest mention before the trial occurs in Aristoph. *Ekkles.* 10 71, and at that time he evidently was living in Athens undisturbed <sup>24</sup>). The play is dated by the scholia at 393/2 B.C., presumably from the *Didaskaliai*; the alliance of 395/4 B.C. of Athens with Boeotia (F 148) had been concluded 'two years previously', and the Scholia (as usually in such cases) reckoned exclusively. No calculation brings us down to 15 392/1 B.C.; there was no reason—and now there is even less—to doubt 393/2 as the year of performance <sup>25</sup>). Also the question about the embassies of Epikrates is solved; we are informed of two: Demosthenes, when talking of the condemnation, has in mind the embassy to Sparta in winter 392/1 B.C.; all the remaining information refers to an embassy 20 to the court of the Persian king together with Phormisios <sup>26</sup>). This embassy can now no longer be dated shortly before the peace of Antialkidas in 387/6 B.C., but probably went not long after the battle at Knidos in 394/3 or perhaps in 393/2 B.C. <sup>27</sup>). A charge was not brought at that time; the charge in which Lysias delivered the concluding speech 25 does not refer to an embassy <sup>28</sup>). (3) For Kratinos we obtain the deme <sup>29</sup>) and the embassy; but he is unknown otherwise and as yet cannot be identified. (4) It is fairly certain that Ebulides is the archon of 394/3 B.C. whose demotikon is the same <sup>30</sup>). The trial of 392/1 B.C. put an end to his career too. It is possible (not more than that, for it is 30 not valid for Epikrates) that he and Kratinos belonged to the conservative party. (5) It is regrettable that Ph. does not give the full name of the accuser, but it is universally agreed that it is the well-known *Καλλιστρατος Καλλιστράτου Ἀφιδναῖος* whose career then began already six years before the King's Peace and who possibly won his political spurs in 35 this trial as Perikles did in that of Kimon. He represented the foreign policy of radical democracy <sup>31</sup>) against the old leader Epikrates who either judged the situation differently (and more correctly, as the King's Peace shows) or was the dupe of Andokides. This party believed Athens capable of fighting against Sparta and Persia at the same time, and was

not yet ready finally to give up the idea of the Empire. The fact that Kallistratos pursued a different policy later on, supporting joint action by Sparta and Athens<sup>32</sup>), does of course not tell against the identification. His later attitude cannot be proved until the peace of 372/1 B.C., but 5 (leaving aside here the problem of Diod. 15, 38) he may have seen things differently already in 375/4 B.C., and perhaps even earlier. Nevertheless (as far as we can see) he neither went over to the conservatives nor did he become a friend of Sparta. When in spring 378 B.C. Sphodrias made the surprise attack on the Peiraieus, Kallistratos was elected strategos 10 together with Timotheos and Chabrias<sup>32a</sup>), and must therefore be counted among those whom Xenophon (*Hell.* 5, 4, 34) calls τῶν Ἀθηναίων οἱ βοιωτιάζοντες. But even that does not tell us anything about his 'inclinations', whereas the part he played in the preparation for, and the conclusion of, the second Naval Federation in 378/7 B.C. speaks more 15 plainly. The attitude of a man who believed in the mission of Athens must have been determined by the course of events and the changes in the constellations: the acceptance of the King's Peace by Athens, too, in 387/6 B.C., the denouncement of the Athenian-Boeotian alliance by Thebes after 386 B.C.<sup>33</sup>), the sudden growth of Thebes, the second Naval 20 Federation—these matters, each at the time, determined the attitude of Athens towards the competition of powers inside Greece. What we see clearly is that in the late 'seventies Kallistratos began to regard Thebes as the greater danger for Athens. But in 392/1 B.C. all this was in the remote future. (6) Ph. corrects the report of Xenophon *Hell.* 25 4, 8, 13/5, doubtful in several respects<sup>34</sup>), about a Spartan offer of peace to Persia which anticipated what Athens in fact conceded five years later. This fact remains, no matter whether (as I believe) Xenophon and Ph. refer to the same event, or whether (which does not seem probable to me<sup>35</sup>) Ph.'s report refers to a later stage of the negotiations. 30 Contrary to the account of Xenophon (or supplementing it) we learn that already in 392/1 B.C. both in Sparta and in Athens the abandonment of the Greeks in Asia Minor was officially discussed; we learn further that the basis of these discussions was a Persian document. Of its contents Ph. preserves the one clause which caused the Athenian rejection, and 35 in quoting it he alone preserved what Diels called 'the authentic words of the King's letter'<sup>36</sup>). We know from Andokides that the treaty established the autonomy of the towns of Greece proper<sup>37</sup>), and we may therefore assume that the King guaranteed this point. The peace therefore was (or should have been) what is ordinarily called a κοινὴ εἰρήνη<sup>38</sup>).

Ph. does not characterize it thus; he calls it technically and accurately *εἰρήνη τὴν κατέπεμψεν βασιλεύς*. Dating it he adds ἐπὶ 'Αντιαλκίδου<sup>39)</sup>. This surprises us and must also have surprised the ancient scholars who used the *Althis*, at least at a time when Plutarch. *Artox.* 21, 5 speaks

5 of the *περιβόητος εἰρήνη ἢ ἐπ' 'Αντιαλκίδου προσαγορευομένη*, understanding the King's Peace of 387/6 B.C., which until the time of the Corinthian alliance and Alexander's campaign to Asia remained, in fact, the foundation for the relations between Greece and Persia. It is regrettable that we do not know how Ph. called this peace<sup>40)</sup>. F 151, where

<sup>10</sup> Didymos is speaking, does not help.

(150) Schol. V Aristoph. *Plut.* 173 φασὶ τοὺς Κορινθίους διὰ τὸ τῶν 'Αθηναίων ἐπικρατὲς συμμαχίαι κεχρηῆσθαι<sup>1)</sup> τῇ ξενικῇ δυνάμει· ἦν δὲ καταστήσας ἐν Κορίνθῳ τοὺς ξένους Κόνων ὁ 'Αθηναίων στρατηγὸς καθελὼν Λακεδαιμονίους, ὅπως φυλάττοι τὴν ἐφοδὸν αὐτῶν. Xenoph. *Hell.* 4, 5, 15 II ff.<sup>2)</sup> ἐγένετο δὲ τὸ τῆς μόρας πάθος τοιῶτιδε τρόπῳ . . . οἱ δ' ἐκ τῶν Κορινθίων ἄστεως, Καλλίας τε ὁ 'Ιππονίκου, τῶν 'Αθηναίων ὀπλιτῶν στρατηγῶν, καὶ 'Ιφικράτης, τῶν πελταστῶν ἄρχων κτλ. Diod. 14, 91, 2 (393/2 B.C) . . . τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων μέρος τῆς στρατιᾶς διήκει διὰ τῆς Κορινθίας χώρας, οἱ δ' ἐκ τῶν 'Αθηναίων ὀπλιτῶν ἐπιπεσόντες τοὺς πλείους 'Ιφικράτης καὶ τινες τῶν ἐν Κορίνθῳ συμμάχων ἐπιπεσόντες τοὺς πλείους<sup>3)</sup> τοὺς ἀνεῖλον. (3) 'Ιφικράτης δὲ μετὰ τῶν πελταστῶν κτλ. Demosth. 4, 24<sup>4)</sup> οὕτως καὶ πρότερόν ποτ' ἀκούω ξενικὸν τρέφειν ἐν Κορίνθῳ τὴν πόλιν, οὗ Πολύστρατος ἡγεῖτο καὶ 'Ιφικράτης καὶ Χαβρίας καὶ ἄλλοι τινὲς κτλ.

The names of the two strategoi show the quotation to refer to the campaign of Agesilaos in 391 B. C. The hoplites under Kallias participated<sup>5)</sup> in the annihilation of the Spartan *mora* near the Lechaion only in so far as their appearance decided the flight of the Spartans<sup>6)</sup>. Iphikrates was strategos also in 394/3 and 393/2 B.C., and his peltasts are mentioned at Corinth already in 392 B.C.<sup>7)</sup> The fame of having used the new troop and improved their equipment is assigned to him<sup>8)</sup>, but he does not seem<sup>9)</sup> to have organized it: Polystratos, whom Demosthenes mentions before him, probably was not an Athenian<sup>10)</sup>. Further, *συνεστήσατο* said in regard to Konon, who was not strategos in the 'nineties<sup>11)</sup>, does not mean 'he organized the troop', but approximately 'acquired' or 'furnished (Athens) with this troop', and he did so with the Persian money with<sup>12)</sup> 35 which he also paid for the rebuilding of the walls of Athens<sup>13)</sup>. The year cannot be stated with full certainty. But as Agesilaos came to Corinth in the month ἐν ζῷ 'Ισθμια γίγνεται<sup>14)</sup> and the annihilation of the *mora* occurred shortly before the Hyakinthia<sup>15)</sup>, the end of 391/0 is more probable (in spite of Diodoros) than the beginning of 390/89 B.C.

(151) The archon is lacking, and the fragment altogether is unfortunately nothing but a very succinct reference of Didymos to another peace mentioned by Ph. The special feature of this peace was the dedication of an altar of Eirene. Didymos, whose business it was to explain Demosthenes, decided to refer the passage to the help given to Konon during the years 397/6 ff. 1); he was interested in the share of Persia only and did not by any means render fully the contents of the treaty 2). We cannot therefore utilize Ph. for deciding the question whether the peace of 375/4 B.C. was a κοινή ειρήνη or a separate peace between Athens and Sparta until we have ascertained whether the fragment refers to the peace of 375/4 or to that of 372/1 B.C. For the participation of the Persian king we have the evidence of Diod. 15, 38; 50, 4-5, who certainly transcribes Ephoros and accordingly speaks in both cases of a κοινή ειρήνη; for 372/1 B.C. we have moreover the evidence of the annalistic entry in Dionys. Hal. *Lysias* 12 'Αλκισθένην ἀρχοντα, ἐφ' οὗ τὴν ειρήνην Ἀθηναῖοι τε καὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι καὶ βασιλεὺς ὤμοσαν, which can with certainty be derived from Ph. 3). Now it has been acknowledged since Grote that either Diodoros, or rather his source 4), produced confusion by recording the rejection of the peace by the Thebans twice: in 372/1 B.C., when it actually occurred, and in 375/4 B.C., when it is incredible. The question therefore is how far the doublet extends, *i.e.* whether it includes the point that the King proposed the peace. This is not *a priori* impossible although Diodoros in 374/3 B.C. supplies particular reasons for this action on the part of the King: Ἀρταξέρξης . . . μέλλων πολεμεῖν πρὸς Αἰγυπτίους καὶ σπεύδων ξενικὴν δύναμιν ἀξιόλογον συστήσασθαι κτλ., for Xenophon *Hell.* 6, 2, 1 (who describes the desire for peace in Athens in 375/4 B.C. quite similarly to Ph. 5) ) does not know, or does not mention, anything about the role of the King 6), whereas he at least indicates it for 372/1 7). But an inference *e silentio* is not conclusive, for Xenophon records quite succinctly. He only says πέμψαντες πρέσβεις εἰς Λακεδαίμονα ειρήνην ἐποίησαντο and passes over not only the expressions of joy in Athens, which are the correlate of her desire for peace, but even the principal clause of the peace which (Ephoros-) Diod. 15, 38 preserved: Λακεδαιμόνιοι μὲν γὰρ καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι, διὰ πάντων περὶ τῆς ἡγεμονίας διαφιλοτιμούμενοι, παρεχώρουν ἀλλήλοις, οἱ μὲν <τῆς> κατὰ γῆν, οἱ δὲ τῆς κατὰ θάλατταν ἀρχῆς ἀξιοί κρινόμενοι. That looks as sound as the special reasons given for the intervention of the King, and such a concession from Sparta, only thirty years after the full defeat and demilitarization of Athens might well be the cause of extraordinary

- celebrations in Athens, although it is now Diodoros who, stating the desire for peace of *all* Greek states <sup>8)</sup>, does not tell of its particular fervour in Athens nor of the expression they gave it by erecting an altar for Eirene, who was thus accepted among the gods of the State <sup>9)</sup>. Therefore
- 5 Diodoros, too, does not decide which peace Ph. has in mind. This gap is filled by Isokrates and Nepos, and the ultimate source of the latter may confidently be assumed to be Ephoros, or in any case a historian of the fourth century. Both append their report to the success of Timotheos at Korkyra (spring / summer 375 B.C.); both confirm the agreement with
- 10 Sparta about the hegemony (though differently as to the form; it is interesting to see how the rhetor and the historian express the same matter); both connect with it the institution of the cult of Eirene: Isokrat. *Antidos*. 109 εἰς μὲν τὸν περίπλου τὸν περὶ Πελοπόννησον τρία καὶ
- 15 δέκα μόνον τάλαντα δούσης αὐτῶι (scil. Τιμοθέωι) τῆς πόλεως καὶ τριήρεις πεντήκοντα, Κόρκυραν εἶλε, πόλιν ὀγδοήκοντα τριήρεις κεκτημένην, καὶ περὶ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον Λακεδαιμονίους ἐνίκησε ναυμαχῶν, <sup>10)</sup> καὶ ταύτην ἠνάγκασεν αὐτοὺς συνθέσθαι τὴν εἰρήνην, ἣ τοσαύτην μεταβολὴν ἑκατέραι τῶν πόλεων ἐποίησεν, ὥστ' ἡμᾶς μὲν ἀπ' ἐκείνης τῆς ἡμέρας θύειν αὐτῇ <sup>11)</sup> καθ' ἕκαστον τὸν ἑναυτὸν ὡς οὐδεμιᾶς ἄλλης οὕτω τῆι πόλει συνενεγκούσης,
- 20 Λακεδαιμονίων δὲ μετ' ἐκείνον τὸν χρόνον μὴδ' ὑφ' ἐνὸς ἐωρᾶσθαι μῆτε ναυτικὸν ἐντὸς Μαλέας περιπλέον μῆτε πεζὸν στρατόπεδον δι' Ἰσθμοῦ πορευόμενον <sup>12)</sup>, ὅπερ αὐτοῖς τῆς περὶ Λεῦκτρα συμφορᾶς εὖροι τις ἂν αἰτιον γεγεννημένον. Nepos *Timoth.* 2 *idem classi praefectus circumvehens Peloponnesum, Laconicem populatus, classem eorum fugavit, Corcyram sub*
- 25 *imperium Atheniensium redegit . . . (2) quo facto Lacedaemonii de diutina contentione destiterunt et sua sponte Atheniensibus imperii maritimi principatum concesserunt, pacemque iis legibus constituerunt ut tum primum arae Paci publice sint factae, eique deae pulvinar sit institutum.* The evidence is
- 30 decisive: F 151 refers to the peace of 375/4 B.C., and at the same time it confirms the information given by Diodoros that this peace, too, came about by the intervention of the King <sup>13)</sup>. Then we need not doubt the reasons adduced by Diodoros: in the following spring Artaxerxes opened his attack on Egypt <sup>14)</sup>.
- 35 The second statement in F 151 ὅτε καὶ τὸν τῆς Εἰρήνης βωμὸν ἰδρῦσαντο, which Ph. probably connected with the first by a simple καὶ <sup>15)</sup>, need not be complete; but by fixing the date for the establishment of the altar it makes an end to a discussion which would have been altogether unnecessary if writers had put a little more confidence in Isokrates and the source of

Nepos, and in particular if they had taken into account that Aristophanes is a comic poet, not a historian or an author of a book on cults <sup>16</sup>). The date is important also for Archaeology because it indisputably proves that 375/4 B.C. is the *terminus post* for Kephisodotos' Eirene with the 5 child Plutos in her arms <sup>17</sup>). When Ph. enters the establishment of the altar of Eirene, using the definite article which shows it to have been the only one; when Nepos states that it was the first one set up by the State; when Isokrates talks of the annual sacrifice offered to Eirene 'from that day onward', this can only mean that in 375/4 B.C. Athens introduced 10 the public cult of Eirene: she was made a goddess, as it were, by decree <sup>18</sup>). The importance of her cult becomes clear by the list of hide-moneys from 333/2 B.C. <sup>19</sup>) which gives the strategoi as those who offer the sacrifices, and the date—a day in the first Attic month before the Panathenaia, probably the sixteenth Hekatombaion. If Nepos by *pulvinar* indicates 15 an invitation of the goddess to a great banquet of the whole people <sup>20</sup>), this implies the cult-image (the altar alone does not necessarily), and the fact that the statue by Kephisodotos was put up in the Agora *μετὰ τὰς εἰκόνας τῶν ἐπωνόμων* <sup>21</sup>) strongly favours the old conjecture <sup>22</sup>) that it was ordered by the State at the introduction of the cult. The dedication 20 did not take place in 375/4 B.C.; or Ph. would have entered it <sup>23</sup>). The work would anyhow take some time, and the restitution of one of the golden Nikai, very credibly connected with this peace by Foucart, falls in the next year ἐπὶ [Σωκρά]τίδου ἀρχοντος. All these considerations fit well into each other, whereas the dating at 403/2 B.C. is improbable 25 for reasons of style, and the reference to the reconciliation of the parties is impossible because the appropriate goddess would be not Eirene but 'Ομόνοια <sup>24</sup>).

This result need not surprise us: in the fourth century we find other cults instituted for such 'personifications' made on certain political oc- 30 casions, and there is no evidence of Eirene as a goddess of cult at an earlier date <sup>25</sup>). The two passages that have been used to prove her as such (Aristoph. *Peace* 1019 f.; Plutarch. *Kimon* 13, 5) have been misinterpreted. When Trygaios opposes the sacrifice of a sheep to the goddess, who has been released from her imprisonment by the joint application of all 35 Greeks, with the words ἀλλ' οὐ θέμις . . . οὐχ ἤδεται δῆπουθεν Εἰρήνη σφα- γαῖς, that does not even permit of the inference that the poet had some theological knowledge of a bloodless cult of Eirene somewhere in the Greek world; even less do vv. 615 ff. mean that Pheidias made a statue of Eirene. It is a light and witty invention <sup>26</sup>), quite analogous to the



objection raised by Hermes v. 532 f. κλαύσ' ἄρα σὺ ταύτης καταψευδόμενος· οὐ γὰρ ἤδεται αὐτῇ ποιητῆι ῥηματιῶν δικανικῶν. This is corroborated by the Scholiasts who do not know of any such cult in Athens although they had at their disposal the entire literature *Περὶ θυσιαῶν*; they let us take our choice between two explanations: either πρὸς ἔθος, viz. a sacrifice for Eirene at the festival of the Synoikia on the sixteenth Hekatombaion, or just invention — τινὲς δὲ φασιν ἐκ τῆς παρούσης αἰτίας οὕτως αὐτῇ θύειν, αἵματος αὐτοῦς ἀπαλλάξασαν. The latter idea is expressed even more distinctly in the second version: πρὸς σύγκρισιν τοῦ πολέμου 10 καλῶς ἔφησε μὴ χαίρειν τὴν Εἰρήνην σφαγαῖς. The first explanation obviously has in mind the sacrifice to Eirene to which belongs the list of hide-moneys of 333/2 B.C.; this is the sacrifice voted in 375/4 which was offered for the first time on the new altar in Hekatombaion 374/3 B.C. and was certainly not bloodless. It is clear enough that the Scholiasts, when cast- 15 ing about for a sacrifice for Eirene, found no other <sup>27</sup>); it is a desperate expedient to assume 'a change of the sacrificial custom', as Nilsson did. Why in 375/4 B.C. the new festival of Eirene was combined with the Synoikia we cannot tell <sup>28</sup>); possibly it was only because the people was so happy about the peace that they placed it in the first month of the 20 year which included the highest festivals in honour of Athena.

Plutarch's anonymous statement (*Kim.* 13, 5) φασὶ δὲ καὶ βωμῶν Εἰρήνης διὰ ταῦτα (viz. the peace of Kallias) <sup>29</sup>) τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἰδρύσασθαι, καὶ Καλλίαν τὸν πρεσβεύσαντα τιμῆσαι διαφερόντως is perhaps even less of a proof. The context in which it stands does not allow of the explanation of Wilamowitz <sup>30</sup>) that 'anyone denying the existence of the peace of Kallias naturally was also obliged to deny the existence of an altar of Eirene'; on the contrary, the unknown author (like Krateros 342 F 13 quoted before him who adduced the document), arguing against Theopompos and Kallisthenes, tried to prove the reality of the peace by referring to the existence of 30 the altar of Peace and to (undefined) honours granted to Kallias. The whole proof is a later muddle: the wrong dating of the altar need not be refuted at length; it is sufficient to state that it contradicts the evidence of Isokrates, (Ephoros-)Nepos and Ph. But it is worth while to add that even without that evidence we should refuse to believe him: after the 35 death of Kimon Perikles could make a peace with Persia, but celebrate this by establishing a cult and a festival for Eirene he could not. The Athenian public, at least at that time, did not regard that peace as a success, but rather as something to be ashamed of <sup>31</sup>), and Wilamowitz cannot have felt comfortable about his contention, for he also brings into

the discussion the peace with Sparta which Perikles certainly did not wish to celebrate in this manner. Moreover, such celebrations are as incompatible with the spirit of the fifth century as a statue for the 'successful' ambassador, who according to another tradition was on the contrary condemned to pay a considerable fine. Here, too, we have evidence to the contrary: the first man after the *τυραννοκτόνοι* to receive a public statue was Konon in, or shortly after, 394/3 B.C. <sup>32</sup>); then his son Timotheos was also given one just because of the peace of 375/4 B.C. <sup>33</sup>). If the statue of Kallias really represented the ambassador of 10 449/8 B.C. it was put up much later (perhaps at the same time as that of Timotheos), and it would merely prove that already in the first decades of the fourth century Athens began to console herself with her great past, and how humble she had become. Of course, the statue would have been placed near the stele with the text of the peace, not the reverse; or both 15 were put up at the same time. The parallel is obvious: Athens believed herself to have re-obtained the hegemony of the sea, formerly conceded to her in the peace of Kallias, by the new treaty with Sparta which was also guaranteed by the King <sup>34</sup>).

Consequently we shall adhere to the tradition which seems ample and 20 certain: because of the peace of 375/4 B.C. Eirene was made a State goddess, an altar was dedicated to her, a grand annual sacrifice was voted, and probably offered for the first time by the strategoi in Hekatombaion 374/3 B.C.; it was not cancelled even in bad times (as little as were the Theorika). The statue of Kephisodotos probably was put up 25 not much later; the State may have ordered it, perhaps at the same time as those of Timotheos and Kallias.

(152) I could not resist printing this fragment as Ph. because the source is absolutely certain <sup>1</sup>): Dionysios apparently uses the *Atthis* of Ph. alone <sup>2</sup>), and there are two more citations from it in the same chapter <sup>3</sup>). The *μετὰ Μενεσθέως στρατηγία* refers to the year of the battle of Embata in 356/5 B.C. <sup>4</sup>), the blame for the loss of which was laid on Timotheos and Iphikrates by their colleague Chares. We know that Menestheus, son of Iphikrates and son-in-law of Timotheos, was also impeached <sup>5</sup>), and that both he and Iphikrates were acquitted whereas 35 Timotheos was sentenced to a fine of a hundred talents <sup>6</sup>), *ὅτι χρήματ' αὐτὸν <Ἀριστοφῶν> ἔφη παρὰ Χίων εἰληφέναι καὶ Ῥοδίων <sup>7</sup>*). As things are it would seem likely that the strategoi were removed and tried on the charge brought by Aristophon in the same year 356/5 B.C., not in the following year 355/4 at the regular euthynai, after they had failed of re-

election for that year; and Diodoros and Nepos (from the same source?) report on these lines: Diodor. 16, 21, 4 (356/5 B.C.) ὁ μὲν Χάρης ἐπιμαρτυρούμενος τοὺς στρατιώτας διέβαλε τοὺς συνάρχοντας ὡς προδότας<sup>9)</sup> καὶ πρὸς τὸν δῆμον ἔγραψε περὶ αὐτῶν ὡς ἐγκαταλελειπότην ἐκουσίως τὴν ναυμαχίαν, οἱ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι παροξυνθέντες καὶ κρῖσιν τῷ Ἴφικράτει καὶ Τιμοθέῳ προθέντες ἐζημίωσαν αὐτοὺς πολλοῖς ταλάντοις, καὶ τῆς στρατηγίας ἀπέστησαν; Nepos *Timoth.* 3, 4 *male re gesta ... litterasque Athenas publice misit* (scil. Chares), *sibi proclive fuisse Samum capere, nisi a Timotheo et Iphicrate desertus esset.* (5) *populus ... domum revocat, accusantur proditionis; hoc iudicio damnatur Timotheus, lisque eius aestimatur centum talentis. ille odio ingratae civitatis coactus Chalcidem se contulit.* Nobody will trouble much about the inaccuracy of Diodoros who records the condemnation of both strategoi. But it certainly is surprising that Diodoros and Nepos here call Iphikrates and Timotheos colleagues (15 συνάρχοντες; *duo veteres imperatores*) of Chares whereas the latter in the same *Vita* (*Tim.* 3, 2) merely makes them advisers of the younger Menestheus: *fit Menestheus praetor, filius Iphicratis, gener Timothei ... huic in consilium dantur duo usu sapientiaque praestantes ... pater et socer.* This may be a simple misunderstanding of a report which gave three (or, with 20 Chares, four) names<sup>9)</sup>, though one is tempted to explain Nepos' account from the singular expression of Ph. τῆς μετὰ Μενεσθέως στρατηγίας, which one can hardly blame on the bad Ms. F alone. But the words of Dionysios are not only corrupt but sorely abbreviated, and the actual difficulty is this: Ph. distinctly gives the year 354/3 B.C. for the εὐθυναί 25 of Timotheos, and for his only (we cannot supply the lost sentence, but probability tells in favour of its having also been about Timotheos; there certainly was nothing about Iphikrates and Menestheus<sup>10)</sup>), and he evidently distinguishes these εὐθυναί from those of the strategoi of the year 356/5 ἐφ' ἧς τὰς εὐθυνας ὑποσχῶν ἐάλω, where again the question is 30 about Timotheos only. It is careless interpretation (which makes Dionysios appear more stupid than he is) when Beloch<sup>11)</sup> contends that 'Dionysios obviously did not find in his sources any date of the trial', and when he concludes that 'he obtained the date 354/3 too, by mere conjecture'. Nor is it possible to refute Dionysios by himself because 35 cause in *Lysias* 12 he assigns the Social War to the years 357/6 and 356/5 B.C., during which period τὴν εἰσαγγελίαν Ἴφικράτης (he alone) ἠγωνίσταται καὶ τὰς εὐθυνας ὑπέσχετο τῆς στρατηγίας, ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ γίνεται τοῦ λόγου (scil. of Ps. *Lysias* Περὶ τῆς Ἴφικράτους εἰκόνοσ) καταφανές. For it is obvious that Ps. *Lysias* is talking about Iphikrates only, Ps. *Deinarchos*

about Timotheos only; and if we add to this point (which in itself is not surprising, if the cases are the regular εῦθυναί) the difference of the dates, there hardly remains another possibility than that the case of Iphikrates was pleaded in winter 356/5, that of Timotheos not until, or 5 still in, 354/3 B.C. <sup>12</sup>). The arguments advanced to prove either the former or the latter year to be correct <sup>13</sup>) are partly not conclusive, partly evidently wrong. But it is easily comprehensible that the historian Ephoros (even if he was informed about the details) treated the proceedings against the strategoi as a coherent action immediately following the 10 campaign, whereas the Atthidographer entered the single actions under the years in which they belonged. What we do not know, and cannot know considering the state of the tradition, is by what means and in what manner Timotheos succeeded in making the trial drag on for more than a year. I leave open the question whether Mazon's comparison with 15 'the procedure followed by Demosthenes in the business of the embassy' <sup>14</sup>) shows the way, and merely point to the fact that whereas we hear some items from Iphikrates' speech of defence, which evidently enjoyed a certain fame <sup>15</sup>), about Timotheos nothing but the fact of his condemnation has come down to us. Only Isokrates in the *Antidosis*, 20 published in 353 B.C., inserted a digression of some length on the man <sup>16</sup>), obviously under the fresh impression of Timotheos' death which appears to have occurred shortly after the condemnation.

(153) Demosth. 19, 84 καὶ ματαία μὲν ἢ πρότερον βοήθει' εἰς Πύλας ὕμιν γέγονεν, ἦν μετὰ πλείονων ἢ διακοσίων ταλάντων ἐποιήσασθε; cf. 18, 32 25 περιπλεύσαντες ταῖς τριήρεσιν εἰς Πύλας. For the army assembled at Thermopylai the Athenians supplied by far the strongest contingent: according to Diodor. 16, 37, 3 (a. 352/1) the figures are 5000 infantry and 400 horse under the strategos Nausikles, as compared with 1000 Lacedaemonians and 2000 Achaeans. The Athenians alone are mentioned 30 by Diodoros 16, 38, 1-2 as having barred the way of Philip, a statement which may derive from another source, perhaps from the same that Trogus used <sup>1</sup>). But I will not touch here either on the question of the sources of Diodoros' 16th book (with its special problem as to doublets in his narrative, which in my opinion are not restricted to the opening 35 of the Sacred War), nor on the still more vexed question of the chronology of the war which is in some way related to the doublet question. It may be sufficient to say that Ph. did not decide the problem as to the date of the occupation of Thermopylai <sup>2</sup>). True, he assigns it (or at least the setting out of the Athenian army) to the year of Thudemos 353/2 B.C.,

but we do not know to which part of the year. It may be the last part, spring 352 B.C., and Diodoros might be adduced to confirm his chronology. For though he records Phayllos' call for help to his allies and their expedition in ch. 37 in the beginning of the archonship of Aristodemus (352/1 B.C.), he gives the same call for help in ch. 36, 1 (this doublet is obvious) in (the end of) the year of Thudemos. I do not trust Diodoros' chronology sufficiently to infer from it the true date, and in any case we cannot decide on the general chronology from a single point.

(154) Since Grote it is assumed generally that kleruchoi were sent to Samos three times <sup>1)</sup>, the first settlement immediately after the conquest of the island by Timotheos in 365/4 B.C. being followed by two 'reinforcements' in 361/0 and in 352/1 B.C. The last settlement is attested by Ph., the second by the Atthidographic entry preserved in Schol. Aischin. 1, 53 εἰς Σάμον κληρούχους ἐπεμψαν Ἀθηναῖοι ἐπ' ἄρχοντος Νικοφῆμου; the first rests on the statement of Diodor. 18, 18, 9 that Perdikkas in 323/2 B.C. ἀποκαταστήσας τοῖς Σαμίοις τὴν τε πόλιν καὶ χώραν κατήγαγεν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν πατρίδα πεφευγότας ἔτη τρισὶ πλείω τῶν τεσσαράκοντα <sup>2)</sup>. As in 365/4 B.C. Timotheos used Samos as starting point for his intervention in the Chersonnese <sup>3)</sup>, the reinforcement of the cleruchy in 352/1 B.C. was preceded by an arrangement with Kersobleptes about the Chersonnese <sup>4)</sup>. We cannot altogether dismiss the possibility that the Athenian kleruchoi were expelled after the battle of Embata; at least the letter, in which Chares denounced his colleagues, says, according to Nepos, *sibi proclive fuisse Samum capere* <sup>5)</sup>. We have only evidence of an accidental kind for the years after 352/1 B.C. <sup>6)</sup>, but, judging from the coins <sup>7)</sup>, Samos does not seem to have been free even for a couple of years.

(155) On Androtion 324 F 30 it has been shown that the relation between him and Ph. down to the sixth book of the latter is the usual one: Ph. copies his predecessor, making occasional alterations as to the matter and (probably more frequently) as to the style. In the present case there is no factual difference in the two reports; also the standpoint is the same. The reports of both Atthidographers are preserved by a chance because Didymos, in order to determine the time of Περί συντάξεως by the historical allusions made in the speech <sup>1)</sup>, consulted as usual his handbook of Attic history, the *Atthis* of Ph., while he found the evidence for the occurrence of ὀργάς in the earlier author Androtion. In these circumstances there is little sense in asking 'which of the two authors proved to be the more exact and the more accurate' <sup>2)</sup>. But as Foucart claims to have found that here and elsewhere 'the copy more or less

distorted the original', and as he drew doubtful inferences from this generalization I wish to state that all divergencies can be explained very simply by the provenience and the purpose of the two extracts. For what has come down is not what the authors themselves wrote but what 5 Didymos quoted. He fully copies the entry of Ph. for the historical fact to which Demosthenes alludes, *viz.* a succinct record of the war in the usual form, giving the name of the strategos <sup>3)</sup> and ending with the achievement of the aim of the war; for the lexical remark about ὄργας he needed only what referred to the word and therefore omitted the 10 purely historical statements with which Androtion's entry began <sup>4)</sup>. It is possible that he abbreviated those statements of Ph. which especially referred to the Orgas, because they were less important for his purpose: compare ὤρισαντο τὴν ὄργάδα τοῖν θεοῖν, ὅπως βούλοιντο with ὤρισαντο τὴν ὄργάδα τὴν ἱεράν, where Ph. even has the slight surplus τὴν ἱεράν. <sup>5)</sup>. 15 Apart from this and possibly apart from slight re-shapings as to the style, what Didymos extracts from the two authors differs only in the manner in which all ancient excerpts differ from each other: they are hardly ever diplomatically accurate by modern standards. Thus the excerpt from Androtion has στῆλαι λιθίνοι, Ph. only στῆλαι; on the other 20 hand the former only has μὴ ἐργαζομένους, the latter ἀνεῖσι καὶ μὴ ἐργαζομένοις. <sup>6)</sup>. All these are divergencies of no importance, and they would probably disappear in part or altogether if we could compare the authors themselves instead of only the excerpts of them.

The passages of Androtion and Ph. are typical annalistic entries, and 25 they do not show that the affair had a previous history of some extent <sup>7)</sup>. One of the stages is revealed by a decree of the year of Aristodemos 352/1 B.C. (*IG<sup>2</sup> II 204 = Syll.<sup>3</sup> 204*), the prescript of which unfortunately is lacking: an Athenian board was established with the task [δικάζειν ἐν τῷ Ἐλευσινίῳ τῷ ἐν ἄστει περὶ τῶν ὄρων τῶν ἀμφισβητούμενων] τῆς 30 ἱεράς ὄργαδος; an enquiry was to be made in Delphi with particular precautions εἰ λῶιον καὶ ἀμεινόν ἐστι τῷ δήμῳ τῷ Ἀθηναίων μισθοῦν τὸμ βασιλέα τὰ νῦν ἐνεργασμένα [τῆς ἱεράς ὄργαδος τὰ ἐν] τὸς τῶν ὄρων κτλ. οἱ ἔπν ἀνετ[α τοῖν θεοῖν <sup>8)</sup>. A committee of three was sent to Delphi, and the proceedings to be taken according to the answer of the god, 35 until the new boundary stones were erected, were laid down in all details. Even that was not the beginning, for in v. 54 the clerk of the Council is instructed ἀναγράφαι τὸδε τὸ ψήφισμα καὶ τὸ πρότερον τὸ Φιλοκράτους [τὸ περὶ τῶν] ἱ[εράων] ἐν στ[ῆλαιν λιθίνων κτλ.], the latter possibly according to the text kept in the archives, unless it served as a general form for

the individual votes about sacred matters <sup>9</sup>). The decree of Philokrates consequently was not new, as it might appear to be according to our F 155; but the readers knew this, Ph. having entered the antecedents *suo anno*. During the demarcation by the board differences with the 5 Megarians occurred <sup>10</sup>); we learn from Demosthenes that a decree was passed to open hostilities against them, and that it was not carried into effect at once <sup>11</sup>); therefore, as *I G<sup>a</sup> II 204* is dated Posideon 16th 352/1 B.C. and some events probably came in between, perhaps not until 351/0 B.C. Afterwards the Athenians really marched in 350/49 B.C. as 10 F 155 reports, and the Megarians gave in, evidently before a battle was fought: the parties left the demarcation to the discretion of the hierophantes Lakrateides and the daiduchos Hierokleides <sup>12</sup>) who had already belonged to the board of 352/1 B.C. under the presidency of the king archon.

15 (156) In ch. 9 Dionysios quotes Ph.s sixth book for the help sent by the Athenians to Olynthos (F 49/51); it is self-evident that he took the capture of the town from the same book. The date is not disputed; even Diodor. 16, 53 has the correct year.

(157) In his fourth Philippica delivered (or published as a pamphlet) in 20 341 B.C. Demosthenes mentions an offer of the King which the Athenians turned down <sup>1</sup>). Because of the expression *καὶ νῦν ἐπιγγέλλετο* it appears probable that the offer had been made recently, and we may therefore assume that Didymos was correct in referring it to the Persian embassy in 344/3 B.C. which received a distinct refusal <sup>2</sup>). He cites on the 25 one hand the reports of two authors (*ἀφηγοῦνται ταῦτα*), not making any distinction between them, *viz.* the Atthidographer Androtion, *ὅς καὶ τότ' εἶπε* <sup>3</sup>), and Anaximenes the historian of Philip <sup>4</sup>); on the other hand he gives a verbatim extract from Ph. with the somewhat surprising introduction *εἶη δ' ἂν ἄμεινον τὰ τοῦ Φιλοχόρου παραγράψαι*. I do not 30 doubt that for both quotations the same explanation is valid: Didymos found Androtion as the speaker in Anaximenes' *Περὶ Φιλίππου ἱστορίαι*, where he also found the speech of 'Demosthenes' against the Letter of Philip and the letter itself (as recast by the historian) <sup>5</sup>). Thus the greatest historical difficulty which the evidence of Didymos presents can be ex- 35 plained. I begin by stating the distinct difference of the contexts <sup>6</sup>). Ph. deals in the typical manner of an annalist, succinctly but completely, with the Persian embassy; as in the letter of Philip <sup>7</sup>) there is no indication of a Macedonian embassy having arrived at the same time and of an *ἄγων λόγων* between the two having taken place in the Assembly. The historian

of Philip, however, records that in 344/3 B.C. Philip sent ambassadors *περὶ εἰρήνης* to Athens, and that the Athenians *βασιλέως πρέσβεις συμπροσέηκαντο*.<sup>8)</sup> It is obvious that Anaximenes, according to a well-known scheme<sup>9)</sup>, combines events not connected as to time nor (at least immediately) as to matter. Didymos, having Ph.s *Atthis* at hand, perceived the difficulty arising, and he therefore added the verbatim quotation although it said the same about the Persian embassy. The latter, according to Ph., arrived in the beginning of the year of Lykiskos (approximately in Hekatombaion 344 B.C.): the archon's name, followed by *ἐπὶ τούτου* is the regular heading for the entries of each year, the following events being joined to the first by *καὶ* unless a more detailed report was necessary<sup>10)</sup>. Philip (as is almost generally agreed) in the course of the year of Lykiskos sent two embassies to Athens<sup>11)</sup>: in autumn 344 B.C. or in winter 344/3 when simultaneously ambassadors of Argos and Messene came to Athens and Demosthenes made his second speech against Philip, and again in spring 343 when he sent the Byzantine Python. The particulars of these embassies do not concern us here, apart from the fact that Persia, or the offer of the King, is not mentioned in this context. We have to deal with the Persian embassy about which alone Ph. reports. It should first be stated that he simply reports its failure, as objectively as he reported the negotiations for a peace in 392/1 B.C. (F 149); the estimation, that the Athenians *ὑποπτικώτερον ἢ ἐχρῆν διελέχθησαν αὐτοῖς* does not derive from Ph. but from Didymos, whether or no he found it in Anaximenes. We must leave open the question whether Ph.s detachment is deceptive. In fact, Athens, not yet having made up her mind to act consistently and to come to an agreement with Philip, committed herself to a vain demonstration, as Demosthenes told his countrymen clearly enough. But it is quite conceivable that Ph., in whose days the relations between Athens and Persia were ancient history, regarded the rebuff to Persia merely as exemplary: it would not be the first and not the only case where we seem to find in him an early instance of the idealizing of 'classic' Athens<sup>12)</sup>. Otherwise what he says is neither wrong nor actually incomplete; with the answer as he sketches it all was said that was needed, and in his annalistic entries and the brief records of his first six introductory books it was not necessary to go into the particulars of the negotiations. We therefore do not learn what the King offered — *ἐπηγγέλλετο* says Demosthenes; and if here, too, he thinks of the earlier help given to Athens by Persia, there may have been a definite offer also in 344/3 B.C.—nor what the King desired Athens to do. That he did desire



something we may assume without hesitation: one does not send an embassy merely to ask whether 'the friendship still continued' unless the factual political situation makes such a question necessary or desirable <sup>13</sup>). In 344/3 B.C., before the intended war with Egypt, this was the case all the more because during the unsuccessful attempt at the end of the 'fifties Athens had by no means behaved in a friendly spirit. One readily understands that the King only wanted to make sure of the benevolent neutrality of Athens during the imminent war, and that, in fact, is what Ph. says with the words ἀξιοῦντος τὴν φιλίαν διαμενεῖν. This general formula may well have been meant as a well-sounding introduction to definite proposals about the requirements of the actual situation. The gap in Ph. is filled by Ephoros, even though Diodor. 16, 44 seems to date the event seven years too early, referring the question to the unsuccessful campaign of Ochos against Egypt in the years 351/0 and 350/49 B.C. <sup>14</sup>):

15 ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἐν μεγάλῳ τιθέμενος τὸ κρατῆσαι τῆς Αἰγύπτου διὰ τὸ πρότερον ἐλάττωμα πρεσβευτὰς ἀπέστειλε πρὸς τὰς μεγίστας τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα πόλεων, ἀξίων οὐστρατεῦσαι τοῖς Πέρσαις ἐπ' Αἰγυπτίους. Ἀθηναῖοι μὲν οὖν καὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι τὴν φιλίαν ἔφασαν τὴν πρὸς Πέρσας τηρεῖν, συμμαχίαν δὲ ἀποστέλλειν ἀντεῖπαν <sup>15</sup>). Θηβαῖοι δὲ . . . Λακράτην ἐξαπέστειλαν

20 μετὰ χιλίων ὀπιτιῶν, Ἀργεῖοι δὲ τρισχιλίους στρατιώτας ἐξέπεμψαν κτλ. Subsequently we are informed that these troops arrived when the King already had laid siege to Sidon <sup>16</sup>). It can hardly be doubted that this was the very embassy recorded by Ph., and that it was to ask for armed assistance against Egypt <sup>17</sup>). Now if the ambassadors came to

25 Athens in 344 B.C. (and according to the correct interpretation of Ph. this again cannot be seriously doubted), if they had before visited the Peloponnese, if the troops sent by Thebes and Argos arrived after Ochos had already opened the campaign (and there seems to be no reason to doubt such a definite statement of facts), this firstly is in accord with the

30 statement of Anaximenes (Ps. Demosth. 12, 6) that the Athenians had voted πρὸ τοῦ λαβεῖν αὐτὸν (*scil.* τὸν Πέρσῃ) Αἰγύπτον καὶ Φοινίκην, and secondly the report of Ph. turns the scales in favour of the assumption that Ochos' campaign belongs in the Attic year 344/3 B.C. This means that Sidon fell approximately in the early autumn of 344 B.C. and that

35 the conquest of Egypt was completed in spring 343 B.C. <sup>18</sup>).

(158) The last words of the entry are corrupt, and it is impossible to restore the text <sup>1</sup>). Since the name of the author usually occurs at the end of a quotation that is not verbatim (with those that are naturally the name almost always precedes) we cannot infer anything from οὖν τοῖς

ἄλλοις (e.g. γενομένοις). As to Ph. it is merely certain that Diopieithes was active at the Hellespont in 343/2 B.C. We know that in the time following the conclusion of the peace of Philokrates Diopieithes led kleruchoi there and that he attacked Kardia <sup>3</sup>). These events belong together. That does not necessarily imply that all this belongs in the same Attic year 343/2 B.C., in which Schol. Aischin. 3, 83 dates the war with Kardia, nor that Dionysios' quotation refers to this war. It goes without saying that Ph. has entered more events under the archon Pythodotos. In that year, probably in its first half, occurred the trials of <sup>10</sup> Philokrates, Aischines, and other 'friends of Macedonia' which Androtion escaped by his flight to Megara <sup>3</sup>); in winter and spring a number of embassies were sent (among them that into the Peloponnese headed by Demosthenes himself), and Athenian troops were dispatched to Ambrakia <sup>4</sup>). All these actions were distinctly directed against Philip, and <sup>15</sup> documentary material for them was available which Ph. certainly did not neglect. The scholion on Aischines mentions part of them only—the embassies, the conclusion of treaties, and the war against Kardia, i.e. events of the later part of the year: 'Αθηναῖοι ἐπὶ Πυθοδότου ἀρχοντος τῷ β' ἔτει τῆς ρθ' ὀλυμπιάδος, Φιλίππου βασιλεύοντος ἔτος ιγ', ὑποπτευομένης <sup>20</sup> λυθήσεσθαι τῆς πρὸς Φίλιππον εἰρήνης, <sup>5</sup>), ἐπεμψαν πολλαχοῦ τῆς Ἑλλάδος πρεσβείας περὶ συμμαχίας <sup>6</sup>), καὶ εἰς Θετταλίαν καὶ Μαγνησίαν (καὶ γανίδα add. Lg) τοὺς περὶ Ἀριστόδημον ἀποστῆναι αὐτοὺς βουλόμενοι ἀπὸ Φιλίππου. ἐγένοντο μὲν οὖν αὐτοῖς τότε σύμμαχοι Ἀχαιοὶ (οἱ Ἀ. V σκαιοὶ γ'), Ἀρχάδες οἱ μετὰ (om. V) Μαντινέων, Ἀργεῖοι, Μεγαλοπολῖται, Μεσσή- <sup>25</sup> νιοι. πόλεμος δ' αὐτοῖς ἐγένετο τότε πρὸς Καρδιανούς, οἷς ἐβοήθησε Φίλιππος. The scholion, of course, does not derive from Ph. directly <sup>7</sup>): neither the form nor the contents tell in favour of an *Atthis* which, however brief its entries, always arranges according to the sequence of the facts in the year, adding documentary evidence as to movers, ambassadors, <sup>30</sup> generals etc. <sup>8</sup>). In the scholion we have the impersonal formulas (ἐπεμψαν πρέσβεις, πόλεμος ἐγένετο), and the mention of the Olympiad and the regnal year are proof sufficient of the scholiast having used some later Chronicle which condensed a number of separate notes (mostly omitting the specifically local traits) into one of those ordinary collective notes <sup>35</sup> concerning a certain historical fact, as for instance a federation against Philip or whatever it might be. As to its ultimate source we cannot make any definite statement: if it was an *Atthis* (and the authors quoted on F 159/60 make this rather probable) one thinks all the more of Ph. as he was the ordinary source of later authors for historical facts concerning

Athens, and as, moreover, it is uncertain whether Androtion's *Atthis* still included the year 343/2 B.C. <sup>9</sup>). Otherwise the archon's date does not help much, for Chronicles also date by the archon, and, generally speaking, 'Ελληνικά and 'Ιστορίαι are more likely sources of universal Chronicles than local histories <sup>10</sup>). Further it is self-evident that a year of a Chronicle cannot simply be equated with an Attic year, and even if it could F 158 is not much use because ἐπι belongs to Dionysios who found the name of Diopieithes under several years in Ph. We therefore unfortunately do not gain anything in regard to the actions of Diopieithes and his further fate <sup>11</sup>), though I do not see any reason to doubt the sequence symmachies—war against Kardia; at least it seems evident that Diopieithes was encouraged in his arbitrary conduct, which led to the verge of a war between Athens and Philip, by the information he received from home about the successful negotiations with the Peloponnesian states. It is not possible to date the attack on Kardia earlier than spring 342 B.C., whereas it is at least not impossible (though not very probable) that it belongs to the beginning of the Attic year 342/1 <sup>12</sup>).

(159-160) Schol. Aischin. 3, 85 (Mnesarchos and the relations between Chalkis and Athens) οἱ δ' υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ Καλλίας καὶ Ταυροσθένης μετὰ Κηφισοφῶντος τοῦ στρατηγοῦ τῶν Ἀθηναίων δυνάμει (δυνάμει g) στρατεύσαντες ἐπ' Ὀρεὸν Φιλισιτίδην (Φιλιππίδην Lg) τὸν τύραννον ἀπέκτειναν ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἀθήνησι Σωσιγένοῦς <sup>1</sup>) μηνὶ Σκιροφοριῶνι, Φιλίππου βασιλεύοντος ἔτος ιβ̄. Steph. Byz. s.v. Ὀρεός. . . Χάραξ ἐν Χρονικῶν ζ̄ (103 F 19) «Ἀθηναῖοι ἅμα Χαλκιδεῦσι τοῖς ἐν Εὐβοίαι καὶ Μεγαρεῦσι στρατεύσαντες εἰς Ὀρεὸν Φιλισιτίδην τὸν τύραννον ἀπέκτειναν καὶ Ὀρείτας ἤλευθέρωσαν». Schol. Aischin. 3, 103 ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Νικομάχου, βασιλεύοντος Φιλίππου ἔτος <sup>2</sup>) εἰκοστόν, Ἀθηναῖοι στρατεύσαντες εἰς Εὐβοίαν Φωκίωνος στρατηγοῦντος τὸν τε τύραννον τῶν Ἐρετριῶν Κλείταρχον ἀπέκτειναν, καὶ τὴν πόλιν τοῖς Ἐρετριεῦσι παρέδωκαν, καὶ δημοκρατίαν κατέστησαν. Diodor. 16, 74, 1 ἐπ' ἄρχοντος δ' Ἀθήνησι Νικομάχου. . . Φωκίων μὲν δ' Ἀθηναῖος κατεπολέμησε Κλείταρχον τὸν Ἐρετρίαν τύραννον καθεσταμένον ὑπὸ Φιλίππου.

In view of the fact that the scholia on Aischines (and the same is valid for Charax) do not derive directly from Ph. <sup>3</sup>) one shrinks from supplementing the *Atthis* from them. Both fragments seem to be verbatim excerpts, and even a καὶ Μεγαρέων, which Foucart because of Charax believes to have dropped out by a mistake of Didymos or the scribe, could hardly be placed in the succinct text of Ph. <sup>4</sup>). Again attention should be paid to Ph.'s manner of recording events in separate notes, each complete in itself, not in a continuous account. It seems likely a

*priori*<sup>5</sup>) that the actions in Euboeia should be regarded as parts of one strategic design intended to deprive Philip of his advanced post in Greece proper<sup>6</sup>). General opinion, recently supported by Beloch, is against the idea that the elimination of Philistides of Oreos and of Kleitarchos of Eretria belong to the same campaign, the tendency being towards separating them by an interval of about a year<sup>7</sup>). But the reasons given are not convincing<sup>8</sup>), and the point of departure of the argument ('for against Oreos Kephisophon was in command, against Eretria Phokion') does not take into account either the nature of annalistic entries or the fact that in the *Atthis* a new year had begun. The suggestion that the tyrant of Eretria first joined Athens and entered into the Euboean federation is improbable in itself because it runs counter to the policy of Athens<sup>9</sup>), and it is contradicted by the fact that Ph. in the relative clause gives a brief pre-history of Kleitarchos which seems to preclude that intermediate stage<sup>10</sup>). F 161 points in the same direction. In my opinion the dates are decisive which, as far as this is possible in a record composed of single entries, elucidate the connexion of events for the reader: F 159 rather surprisingly<sup>11</sup>) supplies the month of the βοήθεια sent to Oreos; it is the last of the Attic year 342/1 B.C.<sup>12</sup>), and the next year, as shown by ἐπὶ τούτου<sup>13</sup>), opens with the attack on Eretria. This is confirmed so far by Diodoros as he also opens his year 341/0 B.C. with the campaign against Eretria, and with this alone; he therefore did not compress the events of several years into one as he frequently does, but forgot what happened in Euboeia in 342/1 B.C. In the treaty of alliance between Athens and Eretria I G<sup>2</sup> II 230 the prescripts are unfortunately lacking. συμμαχίαν πρὸς Χαλκιδεῖς] it is the sons of Mnesarchos who are now applying to Athens: above p. 535, 18 ff.; Aischines 3, 86 ff., where regrettably the documents are missing, but he says in § 92 that ὁ μισοτύραννος Δημοσθένης . . . ἔγραψε δ' ἐν τῇ συμμαχίᾳ βοηθεῖν ἡμᾶς Χαλκιδεῦσι . . . εὐφημίας 30 ἕνεκα προσγράψας καὶ Χαλκιδέας βοηθεῖν, ἐάν τις ἴη ἐπ' Ἀθηναίους . . . λαβέ μοι τὴν Καλλίαι γραφεῖσαν συμμαχίαν ἀνάγνωθι τὸ ψήφισμα. Ὀρείτας] Demosthenes 9, 59 ἀλλ' ἐν Ὀρεῶι Φιλιστίδης μὲν ἔπραττε Φίλιπποι καὶ Μένιππος καὶ Σωκράτης (Σωσιστρατος? Weil) καὶ Θόας καὶ Ἀγαπαῖος, οἵπερ νῦν ἔχουσι τὴν πόλιν . . . Εὐφραῖος δὲ τις ἀνθρώπος καὶ 35 παρ' ἡμῖν ποτ' ἐνθάδ' οἰκήσας ὅπως ἐλεύθεροι καὶ μηδενὸς δοῦλοι ἔσονται κτλ. Philistides, whom alone Ph. mentions, evidently was the leader of the φιλιππίζοντες: cf. *ibid.* 60 Φιλιστίδην καὶ τοὺς μετ' αὐτοῦ; 18, 71 (Φίλιππος) καταλαμβάνων Ὀρεόν, καὶ κατασιάπτων Πορθμόν, καὶ καθιστάς ἐν μὲν Ὀρεῶι Φιλιστίδην τύραννον, ἐν δ' Ἐρετρίᾳ Κλείταρχον; *ibid.*

81 f. Κηφισοφῶντος] This must be the Aphidnean, son of Kephalion. In *P. A.* 8410 (Add.) and *R. E.* XI col. 240 Ph. is not mentioned who attests the *strategia* in 342/1 B.C. *διεπολιτεύετο*] *διαπολιτεύεσθαι*, according to Ammonios, is the correct term for the ἐν μιᾷ πόλει φιλο-  
 5 τιμούμενοι πρὸς ἀλλήλους, but his strict distinction from ἀντιπολιτεύεσθαι is contradicted by the use of the two words in writers of the fourth century B.C. <sup>14</sup>).

(161) It is not certain whether this is a quotation proper, it may be merely a summary made by Didymos of the principal events of the three  
 10 archons' years 342/1-340/39 down to the declaration of war against Philip concerning which the sixth book of Ph. (F 55 b) is quoted in the next lemma. It is therefore by no means certain that by the words ἐπὶ τέλει τῆς Νικομάχου ἀρχῆς some definite event (the expulsion of Kleitarchos, as Beloch assumed) is dated at the end of 341/0 B.C.; the words may  
 15 equally well mean that all the events mentioned occurred before the year of Theophrastos in which the war broke out.

(162) Justin. 9, 1, 1 in *Graeciam Philippus cum venisset . . . bellum toti Graeciae inferre statuit.* (2) *in cuius emolumentum egregie pertinere ratus, si Byzantium . . . receptaculum terra marique copiis suis futurum . . . ob-*  
 20 *sidione cinxit . . .* (5) *igitur Philippus longa obsidionis mora exhaustus pecuniae commercium de piratica mutuatur.* (6) *captis itaque CLXX <X> navibus mercium et distractis anhelantem inopiam paululum recreavit.*

We learn details about the capture of the ships from Ph. alone, who also provides the year. But this does not enable us to arrange the event in the  
 25 context given by the quotations of Dionysios from Ph.'s sixth book (F 53-56) about the outbreak of the war between Philip and Athens. Dionysios intends to give only τὰ ἀναγκαιότατα, and he does not regard as coming under this head what Didymos calls τὸ παρανομώτατον ἔργον. This point certainly weighs against the prevailing opinion, which regards  
 30 that action of Philip as the immediate cause of the declaration of war <sup>1</sup>), even if possibly this was the view taken already by Theopompos and the source of Trogus <sup>2</sup>). The fact that Diod. 16, 77, 2/3, whose chief source Ephoros came to an end with the siege of Perinthos, does not mention the matter may be of no great importance, for he treats the siege of  
 35 Byzantion briefly and insufficiently. But Anaximenes also omits the capture of the ships in the speech which he makes Demosthenes deliver against the 'ultimatum' of Philip: Perinthos and Byzantion are the last items (II, 5), and his eyes were directed towards the share of Persia in this matter, as was also the case with Ph. The genuine Demosthenes

mentions the capture twice, but later in *De corona* § 72 καὶ μὴν τὴν εἰρήνην γ' ἐκεῖνος ἔλυσε τὰ πλοῖα λαβών, οὐχ ἡ πόλις and § 139 ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ φανερώς ἤδη τὰ πλοῖα ἐσεσύλητο, Χερρόνησος ἐπορθεῖτο, ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀττικὴν ἐπορεύεθ' ὁ ἄνθρωπος, οὐκέτ' ἐν ἀμφισβητησίμωι τὰ πράγματα ἦν, ἀλλ' ἐνειστήκει 5 πόλεμος. In both passages the selection and in the second the sequence of events are surprising, but it is evident that Demosthenes chooses actions of Philip which touched Athens directly <sup>3</sup>). In the report of Ph., who by τὰ πάντα manifestly states the total number of the captured ships <sup>4</sup>), part of which the king condemned as lawful prizes <sup>5</sup>), the most important 10 fact is the designation of the latter as τὰ πολέμια. If the term is to be interpreted accurately (and the definite article seems to require this) it shows that Philip considered himself at war with Athens, though this does not necessarily imply that the city on her part had formally declared war. Consequently the capture does not appear, or, at least, is not 15 designated, as an action of piracy as it is in Trogus (and Didymos, who perhaps both derive from Theopompos), it is simply described as a warlike act, and we can understand why Ph. does not inveigh against the παρανομία of the king (like the source of Trogus and Didymos), but soberly records how the coup was possible. He may have narrated events 20 in the same manner as Anaximenes did, and if so he may have used that author's *Philippika*. It is in accord with this view that the squadron of Chares, which was to help Byzantion and to provide convoys for the Athenian ships, was on the spot. In my opinion that dispassionate account is far more credible than the general tradition. If this is correct 25 events can perhaps be dated more accurately than by F 162 alone, torn out of the context as it is. Foucart pointed to the fact that in 362/1 B.C. ἐβδόμη φθίνοντος Μεταγειτνίωνος μηνός the cornships in the Pontos were assembling, having not yet set out for their return-journey <sup>6</sup>). Since Ph. (F 54) expressly assigns the attack on Perinthos to the beginning of 30 the year of Theophrastos (340/39 B.C.) <sup>7</sup>), we may infer that Philip did not lie before the town for such a long time as it appears in the highly rhetorical description of (Ephoros-) Diodor. 16, 74/6. The siege of Byzantion may have begun as early as Metageitnion 340 B.C., and Athens may have declared war in the second half of Boedromion. Nevertheless, neither the 35 departure of Chares for consultation with the Persian commanders <sup>8</sup>) nor Philip's attack on the merchant ships need necessarily be dated after the *official* declaration of war. Philip already had violated Athenian territory when marching on Perinthos <sup>9</sup>), and the Persians already had thrown troops into that town. Chares got into connexion with them at

once, for he could hardly doubt that an attack on Byzantion would mean war, and Philip on the other hand was not a man to be held back by the thin thread of a formality<sup>10</sup>). He saw that Persia was determined to prevent the capture of Byzantion as she had prevented that of Perinthos, and he made use of the favourable moment of the absence of Chares. He seems to have made his sudden attack on the merchant fleet at the very moment when the Demos listened to his letter of complaint and Demosthenes carried the formal declaration of war. Anaximenes evidently recorded matters as they really happened. Demosthenes<sup>11</sup>), in the subsequent defence of his policy, deliberately shifted events because he found the capture of the ships suitable for illustrating the unscrupulousness of Philip's behaviour and for exonerating Athens (and incidentally himself) from the reproach of having started the war.

(163) It seems to be fairly certain that the Harpalos story, at least up to the arrest of the man and the seizure of his money, still belongs to the Attic year 325/4 B.C.<sup>1</sup>). The Assembly which had to decide about the request for extradition passed the motion of Demosthenes *τά τε χρήματα [καὶ τὸν] ἄνδρα φυλάτ[τειν], καὶ ἀναφέρει[ν τὰ χρή]ματα ἅπαντα[ντα] εἰς [τὴν] ἀκρόπολιν . . . ἐν τῇ αὐρι[ον] ἡμέραι, Ἄρπαλο[ν δ' ἤ]δη ἀποδεῖξαι τὰ [χρή]ματα ὅποσα ἐστίν . . . ὁ δ' ἀπεκρίνατο ὅτι ἑπτα[κόσια τάλαντα\* \* \*] ἀναφερομέν[ων τρια]κοσ[ί]ων ταλά[ντων] καὶ πεντ[ή]κοντα ἄν[θ'] ἑπτακοσίων<sup>2</sup>). What is cited under the name of Ph. in the mutilated *Vita* is very little; it is in fact nothing but the total of the sum Harpalos is said to have brought with him and that deposited on the Akropolis; but the latter, at least, has the advantage of being not only documentary but true as well<sup>3</sup>). This does not even imply that Ph. treated the matter in detail: the seventh book of his *Atthis* does not yet seem to belong to those which related the history of Ph.'s own time (as far as it concerned Athens) with minute precision. Of course, he mentioned the trial, which belongs to the winter of the next year (324/3 B.C.), and then he certainly entered the names of the accusers appointed by the people: but whether he entered all of them is uncertain<sup>4</sup>). Nor can the issue have been omitted, not at least the condemnation and flight of Demosthenes. But the details are lost, and we have no right to assume that the report in the *Vita* of Ps. Plutarch is wholly derived from Ph., merely because it refers to him once. Nevertheless, greater discrepancies probably did not exist: the actual events were established, and the few variants of the tradition look more serious than they really are<sup>5</sup>). There is only one serious discrepancy: the *Vita* talks of an extradition to Antipater, and this*

statement, although not proved to be correct by Diod. 17, 108, 7, is at least protected from the suspicion of being due to corruption or confusion. As a matter of fact the Life is rather confused; Hypereides says that ἐπειδὴ ἦλθεν Ἄρπαλος εἰς τὴν [Ἄττικὴν], καὶ οἱ πα[ρὰ Φιλοξέ]νου 5 ἐξαιτουῦντες αὐτὸν ἄμα [προσήχθησ]αν πρὸς [τὸν δῆμον], and he quotes from the speech of Demosthenes οὔτε [τοῖς παρ]ὰ Φιλοξέ[νου ἐλθο]ῦσι καλῶς [ἔχειν τὸν] Ἄρπαλον [ἐγδοῦναι τ]ὴν πόλιν κτλ<sup>6</sup>). The latter must have known, and there is the less reason to mistrust him as the matter belongs to the competence of Philoxenos <sup>7</sup>) who also appears in the 10 anecdotic tradition <sup>8</sup>). This anecdotic tradition is certainly not late, it is rather contemporary; the stories are, however, not so much concerned with the factual events in Athens as with the question of Demosthenes' guilt, they are told in order either to prove or to refute it <sup>9</sup>). We do not have to deal with this question <sup>10</sup>); although our material is by no means 15 scanty, we had better reserve judgment about the actual facts of the case because of the biased tradition. But the material is sufficient for asserting that there is no question of corruption for the purpose of personal enrichment; for the historian there can be no serious doubt that it was an eminently political trial, in which friends and enemies of Macedonia were 20 united for the moment in order to overthrow the only real statesman. All comparisons are imperfect; nevertheless, the tragic senselessness of this trial reminds us forcibly of the trial of Perikles in 430 B.C. <sup>11</sup>). What we must ask is how Ph. judged about the guilt of Demosthenes, or rather whether he passed judgement at all. For that is the problem, and the 25 fact that we can raise but not solve it, not even hypothetically, is perhaps the strongest proof not only of the uncertainty of our knowledge in regard to the greatest *Atthis* but of the inadequacy of fourth century history as well. The trial occurred during the lifetime of Ph. In 324 B.C. he was, if not yet αἰσθανόμενος τῆι ἡλικίαι in the Thucydidean sense, at least 30 a young man, and it is hard to believe that the trial should not have impressed him, and that he should not have perceived (later at least) its symptomatic significance. But tradition yields nothing; there is neither a considered opinion nor the possible after-effect of it in the writings about Demosthenes.

35 (164) Pausan. 1, 8, 3 Δημοσθένης δὲ ὡς τὸ δεύτερον ἔφυγε, περαιούται καὶ τότε ἐς τὴν Καλαυρίαν, ἐνθα δὴ πίων φάρμακον ἐτελεύτησεν, may ultimately derive from Ph., who perhaps gave the mere fact that Demosthenes, escaping capture by the Macedonians, committed suicide by taking poison <sup>1</sup>). Biography, known to us mainly from the report in



Plutarch's *Demosth.* 28-30, added (in various versions) the detail, that Demosthenes sucked the poison out of his style<sup>3</sup>). Thus already Hermippos, who also professed to know the last words Demosthenes had written<sup>3</sup>). He quoted as his authority one Pappos who on his part referred to τοὺς παρὰ ταῖς θύραις Θραϊκίας (evidently soldiers of Archias who guarded the exit of the sanctuary), who maintained that Demosthenes ἔκ τινος βραχίου λαβῶν εἰς τὴν χεῖρα προσθοῖτο τῷ στόματι καὶ καταπιεῖ τὸ φάρμακον, and further to a slave woman who in the examination instituted by Archias testified πολλὸν εἶναι χρόνον ἔξ οὗ φοροῖη τὸν ἀπόδεσμον ἐκεῖνον ὁ Δημοσθένης ὡς φυλακτῆριον. I am doubtful whether this Pappos was an early Hellenistic historian<sup>4</sup>); but I am sure that the ultimate source of Hermippos was a document from the Macedonian archive, the report made to Antipater by Archias who was instructed to arrest Demosthenes and to deliver him into Antipater's hands. The evidence manifestly was contradictory; it merely showed that the death was sudden<sup>5</sup>), and that the responsible officer (justly afraid of Antipater's wrath) inferred poisoning. Demosthenes' nephew Demochares drew another inference from the same circumstances<sup>6</sup>), and Plutarch seems inclined to believe him: τῶν δ' ἄλλων ὅσοι γεγράφασι περὶ αὐτοῦ (πάμπολλοι δ' εἰσί) τὰς διαφορὰς οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον ἐπεξιέναι, πλὴν ὅτι Δημοχάρης ὁ τοῦ Δημοσθένους οἰκεῖος οἶεσθαί φησιν αὐτὸν οὐχ ὑπὸ φαρμάκου, θεῶν δὲ τιμῆι καὶ προνοίαι τῆς Μακεδόνων ὀμότητος ἐξαρπαγῆναι συντόμως<sup>7</sup>) καταστρέψαντα καὶ ἀλύπως. This is, of course, a mere surmise, but, also of course, it is quite possible that a heart-attack put an end to the life of the orator who was more than sixty years old. In any case, the evidence is such that the name of Demosthenes cannot be placed with certainty in the catalogue of famous suicides. Speculations about the kind of poison are quite useless<sup>8</sup>).

(165) The paeon of the poet whose name begins with Hermo- certainly was one of the honours lavished upon the two kings after the capture of Munichia and the solemn restoration of ἐλευθερία and πάτριος πολιτεία in the opening of the year of Anaxikrates 307/6 B.C. <sup>1</sup>), and F 165/6 belong in the context from which F 66 is taken. The paeans recited are those which had been selected in a competition obviously quickly arranged among the poets who happened to be in Athens (or who flocked there at once). There can be no doubt that Hermokles, the victor in the competition, is identical with Hermippos of Kyzikos, whose poems were sung by the Athenians. Consequently one of the names is corrupt; probably Hermippos, who is frequently quoted in Athenaios (thus some

lines earlier p. 696 F) has supplanted Hermokles—if that is the true name of the successful poet. For this, too, is somewhat doubtful: Meineke's identification of him with the Hermodotos of the story told by Plutarch *De Is.* 24 p. 360 C (*Reg. Apophth.* p. 182 C)<sup>2</sup>) seems to be almost certain, though Plutarch does not give the native place of the man at whose poems 'old Antigonos' poked fun.<sup>3</sup>) Unfortunately we cannot decide whether the name is correctly preserved in Athenaios or in Plutarch<sup>4</sup>), for neither Hermokles nor Hermodotos is otherwise known.

(166) About the context see on F 165. Stiehle *Philol.* 8, 1853, p. 643 and Reitzenstein *GG Nachr.* 1906 p. 3 were certainly right in referring F 166 also to the honours conferred on the two kings in 307/6 B.C. and in assigning it to the *Althis*, not to *Περὶ ἡμερῶν*. The Scholiast on Pindar, when explaining *ιερομηναία Νεμεάδι*, distinguishes three meanings of the word<sup>1</sup>): (1) the first day of the month: *ιερομηναίαν δὲ λέγουσι κατὰ σύντημσιν τὴν ἱερονουμηναίαν· αἱ γὰρ τῶν μηνῶν ἀρχαὶ ἱεραὶ εἰσι τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος, καθὼς αὐτὸς δοκεῖ εἶναι τῷ Ἥλιῳ;* (2) the day of a festival or the festival itself (= *εορτή*): *ἐν ἧι μέλλομεν ἡμέραι τὸν εἰς τὴν Νεμεακὴν νίκην ὕμνον γράφειν (ἄιδειν Abel), ὁ ἔοικε δὲ ὁ Πίνδαρος νῦν ἱερομηναίαν λέγειν τὴν τῶν ἐπινίκων εορτήν,* and (more generally) *ιερομηναία δὲ λέγονται αἱ ἐν τῷ μηνὶ ἱεραὶ ἡμέραι οἷαι δῆποτε θεοῖς ἀνειμένα;* (3) the holy or festival month: *οἱ δὲ ἱερὸν μῆνα καθόλου λέγουσι κεκληῖσθαι, ἐν ᾧ τὰ Νέμεα ἄγεται.* His authority for the third meaning seems to be Ph.<sup>2</sup>), and this is in accord with Plutarch. *Demetr.* 12, 2, who describes the alleged fact more fully: *τέλος δὲ τῶν τε μηνῶν τὸν Μουνουχιῶνα Δημητριῶνα καὶ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὴν ἔτην καὶ νέαν Δημητριάδα προσηγόρευσαν, καὶ τῶν εορτῶν τὰ Διονύσια μετωνόμασαν Δημητρία.* This means three different honours—the change of the name of one of the twelve months, the choice of which is difficult to explain<sup>3</sup>), of one (the first) day in each month, of a festival which cannot fall in the re-named month if it took the place of Dionysia—but all three concern Demetrios alone, and the idea of all is to bring his name into the calendar with *Δημητριῶν, Δημητριάς, Δημητρι(ε)α*. One feels justified in assuming that they formed a unity, *i.e.* that they were bestowed by clauses of one and the same decree. The discussion about the authenticity of the three honours has not yet yielded a satisfactory result, and this is, in my opinion, partly due to the fact that their belonging together has not been considered sufficiently. For although the first clause is attested by Ph. (apart from Plutarch) and the second by Polemon<sup>4</sup>)—both excellent witnesses—objections have been raised again and again against all three, for none of them is provided with

documentary evidence by any of the numerous inscriptions of this or the following years; on the contrary, the former two are disproved by the inscriptions <sup>5</sup>), and if the third honour was bestowed an inscription of 293/2 B.C. shows that the statement of Plutarch is at least inaccurate <sup>6</sup>).

5 On the other hand it is difficult to tell whence the wrong statements came, if they were not founded on facts. It is almost impossible to believe that decrees passed in honour of Demetrios should either not have been carried out or so soon annulled as not to leave any traces in the documentary tradition <sup>7</sup>), nor is it credible that it should be a matter of

10 'exaggerations', or of downright inventions, either by historians who criticized the undignified conduct of Athens, or by comic poets who attacked Stratokles <sup>8</sup>). Polemon would hardly have been deceived by inventions like that and certainly not Ph., a contemporary of the events. There seems to be only one way out of the dilemma: we shall have to

15 blame the writers who used the *Atthides* (in this case Ph.), because they recorded as facts what in the full description which their source gave was recorded merely as motions. One may point out that the group of three honours which were to be conferred on Demetrios alone, not on Antigonos and Demetrios together like those which are enumerated in ch. 10

20 from the motion of Stratokles <sup>9</sup>), does not occur in the narrative proper but in a kind of appendix (ch. 12, 1-2) to ch. 11, which may be called a digression about Stratokles. This ch. 11 opens with his *ὑπερφύεστατον ἐνθύμημα*, the motion *ὅπως οἱ πεμπόμενοι κατὰ ψήφισμα δημοσίαι πρὸς Ἀντίγονον ἢ Δημήτριον ἀντὶ πρεσβευτῶν θεωροὶ λέγοντο*. It is perhaps not

25 impossible that the motion of the demagogue contained further clauses which were not passed, but which Ph. reported in order to characterize the man whose policy he must have severely condemned. But judging from the position of the digression in ch. 12, it seems more likely that the questionable honours come from the motion of a *ὑπερβαλλόμενος ἀνε-*

30 *λευθερίαι τὸν Στρατοκλέα*. Plutarch records such a motion in ch. 12, 1—*δέχεσθαι Δημήτριον ὁσάκις ἂν ἀφίκηται τοῖς Δήμητρος καὶ Διονύσου ξενισμοῖς κτλ.*—, and it appears obvious that its mover tried to outbid Stratokles' motion to erect a *βωμὸς Δημητρίου Καταιβάτου* at the place *ὅπου πρῶτον ἀπέβη τοῦ ἄρματος* (ch. 10, 5) which, though ridiculous, at least had some

35 religious sense. The Assembly presumably rejected this motion to outstratokles Stratokles; otherwise Plutarch would have been able to give the name of the mover. This is what the authors who used the *Atthis* failed to recognize. The fact that the clause about the altar of Demetrios Kataibates also refers to Demetrios alone does not tell against this

conjecture that ch. 10 mainly deals with the decree of Stratokles, though it is possible that it was a rider (τὰ μὲν ἄλλα ὡς κτλ.). Graver doubts are raised when the report about the motion of Stratokles in ch. 10 also contains an obviously wrong clause, *viz.* that from 307/6 B.C. the years were officially named not after the archon but after the new priest of the Σωτῆρες<sup>10</sup>). But that again may be explained by the abbreviation of a full report about the proceedings in the Assembly by the source of Plutarch, who himself did not use here Ph. directly.

(167) The fragment is proved to be Ph. by F 67; see on F 67 and F 152.

- 10 (168) Hesych. s.v. Γενέσια (Lex. rhet. p. 231, 19 Bkr) ἑορτὴ πένθιμος παρ' Ἀθηναίους · οἱ δὲ τὰ νεκύσια · καὶ ἐν ἡμέραι τῆι Γῆι θύουσιν<sup>1</sup>). Phrynich. *Ekl.* 83 p. 184 Ruth. Γενέσια · οὐκ ὀρθῶς τίθεται ἐπὶ τῆς γενεθλίου ἡμέρας · Γενέσια γὰρ Ἀθήνησιν ἑορτὴ ·<sup>2</sup>) λέγειν οὖν δεῖ τὰς γενεθλίους ἡμέρας ἢ γενέθλια.<sup>3</sup>) Ammonios *De adfin. voc. diff.* s.v. Γενέθλια καὶ  
 15 Γενέσια διαφέρει · ὅτι μὲν γὰρ γενέθλια τάσσεται ἐπὶ τῶν ζώντων, καὶ ἐν ἡμέραι ἑκάστοις ἡμέραι ἐγενήθη, αὐτὴ καλεῖται γενέθλιος ἡμέρα · γενέσια δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν τεθνηκότων, ἐν ἡμέραι ἑκάστοις τετελεύτηκε. ὁ οὖν λέγων ἐπὶ τῶν ζώντων γενέσια ἀκυρολογεῖ<sup>4</sup>). Pollux 3, 102 ἐκφοραί, ἑνατα, τριακάδες, γενέσια, νεκύσια · ταῦτα γὰρ ἐπὶ θεραπείαι τῶν ἀπηλλαγμένων ἐνενομίστο. We  
 20 are not concerned with the Atticistic discussion which rejects the use of γενέσια for the birthday<sup>5</sup>) and can confine ourselves to the heortological fact which most probably was brought into the discussion through the Λέξεις of Aristophanes of Byzantium<sup>6</sup>). The grammarian found the evidence for the festival in Ph. together with the reference to the Axones,  
 25 for he himself quotes Solon's laws as Νόμοι<sup>7</sup>), and he seems to have arranged his evidence chronologically<sup>8</sup>). His excerpts abbreviated the quotation in several directions, but even the lexicographical tradition leaves no doubt that the old Genesia was a festival of the dead<sup>9</sup>). Herodotus' description of the funeral rites of the Issedones (4, 26) confirms  
 30 this — παῖς δὲ πατρὶ τοῦτο ποιεῖ, κατὰπερ Ἑλληνες τὰ Γενέσια — and we derive from it the further essential fact that the Genesia was a festival of the family (clan) as their name tells<sup>10</sup>). If in Athens it is a public festival the conclusion is certain that Solon either entirely abolished the γενικά  
 35 (ἐρά<sup>11</sup>) of the individual clans or restricted them, establishing in their place a festival of the dead for the whole people. That may be one of the measures by which he tried to restrict the sumptuousness of private burials<sup>12</sup>), but the proper sense of that measure can be understood only in the light of Solon's constructive idea, his endeavour to change the clan-state to a citizen state. This also explains the fixed calendar date.

The festival need not necessarily have been introduced by a special law; it is more likely that it was simply admitted into the sacrificial calendar which was part of Solon's legislation and of which the recent finds in the Agora have enabled us to form a more accurate conception<sup>13</sup>); Hesychios has preserved the sacrifice to Ge. As to Ph. we might suppose at first sight that the fragment derives from the special book *Περὶ ἑορτῶν*, the two certain fragments of which (F 83/4) give calendar dates of Athenian festivals, but we expect the State festival to be mentioned in the *Atthis* as well<sup>14</sup>). Here it was probably not entered under the year 594/3 B.C.,  
 10 Ph. not having recorded fully either the sacrificial calendar or the profane legislation. It is more likely that he mentioned it (like the law about the phratries which is much more important politically: F 35) in one of his retrospective digressions of which there seems to have been a considerable number particularly in the books 3 and 4. I suppose the occasion  
 15 was the decree about the collective funeral of the fallen in war at the State cemetery in Kerameikos, by the institution of which the character of the general festival of the dead was considerably altered. For this *πάτριος νόμος*, which Thukydides dates not at all or far too early, we infer from Pausan. I, 29, 4/5 and from the independent evidence of  
 20 Athenian burials the year 465/4 B.C. and thus the third book of the *Atthis*<sup>15</sup>).

(169) a is an insertion of Athenaios into his excerpt from the book *Περὶ τοῦ τῶν ἡρώων καθ' Ὀμηρον βίου* which he attached quite loosely to the line *Iliad* Ω 262 ἀρνῶν ἤδ' ἐρίφων ἐπιδήμιοι ἀρπακτῆρες, obviously mis-  
 25 interpreted by ἀναλίσκειν τὰ μὴ νενομισμένα<sup>1</sup>). In b the quotations of both Atthidographers are taken from a lexicographic context, viz. an excerpt from the book of Aristophanes of Byzantium entitled *Περὶ ἡλικιῶν*<sup>2</sup>). As far as we can see Ph. supplemented Androtion, for the reason of the prohibition is the same economic one in both authors, though both  
 30 passages have been abridged so severely that the context in which they occurred is no longer recognizable. Concerning Androtion it is at least conceivable that he quite generally described the simple life in ancient times. Ph. seems to have had in view a special case (cf. κατὰ χρόνον δέ τινα), perhaps an aition from mythical times<sup>3</sup>). It is a rather doubtful  
 35 guess that he explained the Buphonia legend<sup>4</sup>), though Androtion, too, mentioned a custom still existing in the cult of Athena. F 98 does not help.

(170) Only the first sentence can with certainty be assigned to Ph., who is quoted again p. 38 CD (F 5). It may belong to the same context  
 Jacoby, *Fragment. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.)

as F 5-7 from the second book of the *Atthis*, to which one may be inclined to assign F 171/2, too. As this discussion contains speculations about the nature of the god Dionysos and as it mentions the tomb of Dionysos at Delphi (F 6/7) it is possible that the excerpt from Ph., interrupted by 5 paroemiographic parallels and lexicographic discussions, is continued in the juxtaposition of Apollo and Dionysos. One might find a corroboration for this suggestion in F 172. But all these speculations are uncertain.

(171) If the quotation from Pherekrates still belongs to the excerpt from Ph. it appears that the custom did no longer exist in his time. The 10 fragment of Phanodemos (325 F 12), following in Athenaios, belongs to this context only so far <sup>1)</sup> as the new wine, which evidently the citizens themselves brought, is drunk in the sacred precinct of Dionysos; but it shows, anyhow, that such things could be mentioned in the *Atthis*. C. Mueller's attribution to Περὶ τῶν Ἀθήνησι ἀγῶνων is not more than 15 possible.

(172) For the context in which Ph. discussed these matters see on F 170; 171. According to ancient theory the dithyramb originally belonged to Dionysos alone, and to Apollo the paeon <sup>1)</sup> which in *Il. A* 470/4 the men sing when drinking. Plato <sup>2)</sup> criticizes the obliteration of 20 the borderlines between the different μέλη εἰς θεούς by the moderns, and Ph., who mentions the παλαιοί, may have expressed a similar opinion. That is why the source of Athenaios quoted him, which opens (in the sense of Plato) with the thesis ἀλλὰ μὴν οἱ ἀρχαῖοι καὶ περιέλαβον ἔθεισι καὶ νόμοις τοὺς τῶν θεῶν ὕμνους ἀιδεῖν ἅπαντας ἐστιάσειν, ὅπως καὶ διὰ 25 τούτων τηρῆται τὸ καλὸν καὶ σωφρονικὸν ἡμῶν and concludes with the statement ὅτι μὲν οὖν οὐχ ἡδονῆς χάριν ἐπιπολαῖοι καὶ δημοτικῆς ἢ μουσικῆ προῆλθε κατ' ἀρχὰς εἰς τὰς ἐστιάσεις, ὥσπερ ἔνιοι νομίζουσι κτλ. One is reminded of the emphatic declaration in F 6: οὐ γάρ, ὥσπερ τινὲς λέγουσιν, βωμολόχον τινὰ καὶ κόβαλον γίνεσθαι νομιστέον τὸν Διόνυσον.

30 (173) The ritual custom is, of course, a fact. Ph. interpreted it symbolically. As it is the business of the Horai to protect the crops from the excessive heat of the sun it seems probable that the sacrifice of the Thargelia is meant. Theophrastos knows ἡ Ἀθήνησιν ἔτι καὶ νῦν δρωμένη πομπῇ Ἑλλίου τε καὶ Ὠρῶν <sup>1)</sup>; and Schol. Aristoph. *Eq.* 729 (*Plut.* 1054) 35 says that Πυρρανεψίους καὶ Θαρρηγίλους Ἑλλίω καὶ Ὠραῖς ἐορτάζουσιν Ἀθηναῖοι. <sup>2)</sup> The fragment may be taken from Περὶ θυσιῶν, but the *Atthis* is not impossible: according to F 5 king Amphiktyon established an altar of Ὀρθός Διόνυσος in the sanctuary of the Horai; αὐταὶ γὰρ καὶ τὸν τῆς ἀμπέλου καρπὸν ἐκτρέφουσιν. Like the mixing of wine cooking is

considered an advance in civilization; Theophrastos<sup>3</sup>) (who abhors bloody sacrifices) used the *φαίειν* of corn in this sense, regarding the *πομπή* mentioned above as an indication of this advance. References to civilization are particularly manifest in the first two books of the *Atthis*,  
 5 and we must bear in mind that Ph. also wrote *Εὑρήματα*. It is therefore possible that F 173 belongs to a detailed description of the mode of life of the *παλαιοί* appended to the account of the introduction of the cults of Dionysos and Demeter.

(174) About the way in which these quotations were brought to medie-  
 10 val writers see *Introd.* p. 240 f. The narration is clearly coherent<sup>1</sup>), one of many rationalistic explanations of the Homeric monster<sup>2</sup>). It is not surprising in itself to find such a story in Ph.<sup>3</sup>); the context only, in which it occurred, is doubtful since (as far as we can tell) it has no immediate connexion with the history of Athens. But it is by no means  
 15 certain that F 174 was taken from the *Atthis*<sup>4</sup>). As to the details, Phorkos as the father is one of the variants of Skylla's descent<sup>5</sup>), and his localization in Sardinia is proved to be old by the equally rationalistic narrative *Serv. Vergil. A. 5, 824: ut autem Varro dicit, rex fuit Corsicae et Sardiniae; qui cum ab Atlante rege navali certamine cum magna exercitus parte fuisset*  
 20 *victus et obrutus, finxerunt socii eius eum in deum marinum esse conversum*<sup>6</sup>). A Corinthian Sthenelos is unknown, and the reference of *ibidem* is uncertain. It is possible that the *locus* was neither Sicily nor Corinth but the promontory of the Argolis farthest to the east<sup>7</sup>), which generally derives its name from Skylla daughter of Nisos<sup>8</sup>). Then the death of  
 25 Skylla must have taken place in the course of the long journey from Sardinia to Corinth. The question may remain open whether Ph., if (and wherever) he dealt with Skylla, discussed the homonymous bearers of the name. But we can hardly assume that he knew a Skylla independent from the *Odyssey*<sup>9</sup>), for his princess comes from the West.

30 (175—176) The learned information about individual gods which Clement puts together in ch. 2 of his *Protrepticus*, not in any particular order, has passed through several hands. I should not like to guarantee that the entry about Kronos really belongs to Ph., for it has no internal connexion with that about Poseidon Iatros; and if it does belong to Ph.  
 35 I am not sure whether it renders correctly his opinion<sup>1</sup>). A buried god would not be impossible for him, even though Dionysos in F 7 is not quite on the same level with Kronos; but our tradition, though acquainted with numerous hills of Kronos, particularly in the West, does not know a tomb<sup>2</sup>). It is not easy to believe with Pohlenz<sup>3</sup>) that Ph. 'transferred

to the chief of the enemies of Zeus' what is valid not even for all Titans but for Typhos alone <sup>4</sup>). A confusion or a deliberate re-interpretation seems more likely, and for the latter earlier criticism of Greek religion would be responsible, not Clement, whose account ultimately derives from it. The two entries about the cult of Poseidon on Tenos are probably taken from the same context <sup>5</sup>). That may have been a digression about the god who was important for Athens, and we may conceive this as resembling the digression about Dionysos in F 5/7 which was not restricted to Athens. But the artist Telesinos <sup>6</sup>) belongs to the first third of the third century, and that fact would make it more likely that the quotations come from one of the later books of the *Atthis*: since probably 278 B.C. the sanctuary on Tenos was rebuilt, the cult was reorganized, the festival of the Ποσειδεα instituted, and the temple proclaimed an asylum <sup>7</sup>). The Delphic oracle authorized the reorganization <sup>8</sup>), and we may assume that Athens was not missing among the Greek states which contributed to the building, acknowledged the asylum, or promised to send delegations to the festival, for her relations with Tenos were very friendly in the period of the Diadochs <sup>9</sup>). Poseidon Iatros is unique, and in view of the general nature of the god very remarkable. The inscriptions of Tenos as yet do not furnish the epithet, and the interpretation of the dedications *IG XII* 5 no. 916 ff. by relatives as being 'statues of healed persons' appears to me very doubtful, for they are not inscribed Ποσειδῶνι 'Ιατρῶι, nor even simply Ποσειδῶνι, but throughout Ποσειδῶνι καὶ Ἀμφιτρίτηι. Nos. 918 and 922, moreover, give distinctly other reasons for the dedication—  
<sup>25</sup> τριηραρχήσαντα τῶν νησιωτῶν and [τὸν τετιμημένον ὑπ]ὸ τοῦ δήμου ταῖς με[γίσταις τιμα]ῖς. On the other hand, to assume a corruption in Clement is a desperate expedient <sup>10</sup>), and the cult of Asklepios, being presumably considerably later, is certainly not evidence against Ποσειδῶν 'Ιατρός <sup>11</sup>). Such singularities can rarely be explained <sup>12</sup>), because there may have  
<sup>30</sup> been a particular occasion which was forgotten in the course of time. After all, a great god, perhaps originally the only great god of the island, may easily have been revered as a healing god, too, or he may have taken over that function from an earlier, pre-Hellenic deity, if not from a healing spring <sup>13</sup>). Failing other evidence we remain in the dark about  
<sup>35</sup> this cult.

(177) Hesych. s.v. Θεσεῖον · νεῶς Θεσεῶς, ἐφ' ἃν οἱ ἀποδιδράσκοντες κατέφευγον . . . καὶ τὸ δεσμωτήριον (τι δικαστήριον?) παρὰ Ἀθηναίους. *Lex. rhet.* p. 264, 21 Bkr Θεσεῖον · τὸ τοῦ Θεσεῶς ἡρώιον · ἔστι δὲ ἄσυλον τοῖς οἰκέταις. *Schol. Aristoph. Eq.* 1312 (*Suda* s.v. Θεσεῖον) καθήσθαι μοι



δοκεῖ / ἐς τὸ Θησεῖον πλεούσαις ἢ 'πι τῶν Σεμνῶν θεῶν] ἐνταῦθα οἱ κατα-  
 φεύγοντες τῶν οἰκετῶν ἀσυλίαν εἶχον . . . εἰς τὸ τῶν Ἐρινύων ἱερὸν · καὶ ἐν-  
 ταῦθα δὲ οἱ οἰκέται (ἰκέται Sud) ἔφευγον. Schol. Aischin. 3, 13 νόμος δ' ἦν  
 τοὺς ἀποφυγόντας τῶν οἰκετῶν εἰς τὸ τοῦ Θησέως τέμενος ἀτιμωρήτους εἶναι.  
 3 Plutarch. *Thes*, 36, 4 κεῖται μὲν (*scil.* Θησέως) ἐν μέσῃ τῇ πόλει παρὰ τὸ  
 νῦν γυμνάσιον <sup>1)</sup>, ἔστι δὲ φύξιμον οἰκέταις καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ταπεινότεροις καὶ  
 δεδιόσι κρείττονας, ὡς καὶ τοῦ Θησέως προστατικοῦ τινος καὶ βοήθητικῆς γε-  
 νομένου καὶ προσδεχομένου φιλανθρώπως τὰς τῶν ταπειντέρων δεήσεις. Diodor.  
 4, 62, 4 οἱ δ' Ἀθηναῖοι μεταμεληθέντες τὰ τε ὅσα μετήνεγκαν καὶ τιμαῖς  
 10 ἰσοθέοις ἐτίμησαν αὐτόν, καὶ τέμενος ἄσυλον ἐποίησαν ἐν ταῖς Ἀθήναις τὸ  
 προσαγορευόμενον ἀπ' ἐκείνου Θησεῖον. The reports which connect  
 the establishment of the sanctuary with the transference of the bones of  
 Theseus in 476/5 B.C. <sup>2)</sup> together with Ph.'s τὸ παλαιόν make it appear  
 probable that the latter told of the right of sanctuary retrospectively  
 15 under this year. The fact that he knew shrines of Theseus in Attica  
 established during the life-time of that king <sup>3)</sup> does, of course, not con-  
 tradict, though perhaps we had better not draw the historical inference  
 that the right of sanctuary in 'the Theseion' was extremely old <sup>4)</sup>. The  
 passage in Plutarch (which may derive from Ph.) shows that when  
 20 mentioning the wider extent of the right of asylum in earlier times Ph.  
 did not think of cases of mythical ἰκετεῖαι <sup>5)</sup> but of the protection of the  
 little man against the nobility by the 'democratic' king <sup>6)</sup>. It must remain  
 an open question whether (or rather how far) Ph. was correct in assuming  
 a wider extent and an earlier existence of the right to asylum at the  
 25 shrine(s) of Theseus, and what reasons he had for his assertion. The  
 evidence we have is later than 476/5 B.C., and it refers to slaves only <sup>7)</sup>.  
 The δίκαι mentioned in the Etymologicum probably mean the discussions  
 taking place between the masters and their fugitive slaves, for whom  
 κράτιστόν ἐστιν εἰς τὸ Θησεῖον δραμεῖν, / ἐκεῖ δ' ἕως ἂν πρᾶσιν εὐρωμεν, μέ-  
 30 νειν <sup>8)</sup>; they require the intervention of a magistrate <sup>9)</sup>.

(178) Both versions of the gloss, which probably comes from the  
 commentator of Homer Seleukos <sup>1)</sup>, have a linguistic (etymological) and  
 a factual (cultic) section. The former deals with the meaning and the use  
 of the word which first appears *Il.* I 219 f.—θεοῖσι δὲ θύσαι ἀνάγει / Πά-  
 35 τροκλον δὲ ἐταῖρον · ὁ δ' ἐν πυρὶ βάλλε θυηλάς. οἱ δ' ἐπ' ὄνειθα' ἐτοῖμα  
 προκείμενα χεῖρας ἵαλλον — where it manifestly means the portion of the  
 meal which before partaking of it one offers to the gods <sup>2)</sup>. The latter  
 takes from Ph. the evidence of what the θυηλαί are. The quotation  
 unfortunately is very succinct, and the text is not quite certain; but if

Ph. calls them Γῆς παῖδες<sup>3)</sup> they are divine persons, and in that case *ἀς* *πρώτας* will have to be changed to *αἷς* *πρώταις*, while *θεοῖς*, which is lacking in the *Eklogai*, had better be deleted. If the present tense is correct (the Etymologicum has the unintelligible *θῦσαι*) we have to do  
 5 not with a mere speculation which, in order to explain a difficult word, simply invents an eponym<sup>4)</sup>, to whom one offered sacrifices 'at first', *i.e.* in primeval times; we should have to assume rather that there really existed in Athens such figures to whom generally, or in certain cults, one  
 10 'first' offered a sacrifice, *i.e.* a preliminary one before the sacrifice proper. In view of our limited knowledge we cannot forthwith reject this possibility<sup>5)</sup>.

(179) It is at least not improbable that Ph. in *Περὶ μαντικῆς* discussed dreams, too (cf. on T 7). About the laurel in cult and in popular belief see Steier *RE* XIII col. 1439 ff.; about its importance at Delphi see also  
 15 Allen-Halliday-Sikes *The Homeric Hymns*<sup>3</sup>, 1936, p. 254; Parke *The Delphic Oracle*, 1939, p. 25 f.; about its use for producing dreams that come true Hopfner *Griech-Aegypt. Offenbarungszauber* II, 1924, § 191 f.; 201.

(180) The interpretation of the passage in Demosthenes is shown to be  
 20 correct by Aristoph. *Ach.* 994 ff. ἀλλά σε λαβῶν τρία δοκῶ γ' ἂν ἔτι προσβαλεῖν / πρῶτα μὲν ἂν ἀμπελίδος ὄρχον ἐλάσαι μακρόν, / εἶτα παρὰ τόνδε νέα μοσχίδια συκίδων, / καὶ τὸ τρίτον ἡμερίδος ὄρχον, ὁ γέρων δδὶ, / καὶ περὶ τὸ χωρίον ἐλαΐδας ἅπαν ἐν κύκλωι, / ὥστ' ἀλείφουθαί σ' ἀπ' αὐτῶν κάμῃ ταῖς νομηνίαις. That seems to be the regular manner of planting, known already to  
 25 the laws of Solon: Pollux 5, 36 Σόλων δὲ καὶ στοιχάδας τινὰς ἐλάας ἐκάλεσε, ταῖς μορίαις ἀντιτιθεῖς, ἴσως τὰς κατὰ στοιχὸν πεφυτευμένας. Ph. may have mentioned these olives in the passage where he related that even the Lacedaemonians spared the sacred trees (F 125). It is not likely that Didymos, who wrote a book *Περὶ τῶν ἀξόνων τῶν Σόλωνος ἀντιγραφή πρὸς*  
 30 *Ἀσκληπιάδην* (no. 340) meant something different by *γένος* τι.

(181) The history of the Athenian *πομπεῖα* does not, of course, begin with the year 403/2 B.C.: the Thucydidean Perikles (2, 13, 4), when giving his survey of the financial position of Athens in 431 B.C., mentions among other things *ἄσφα ἱερὰ σκευὴ περὶ τε τὰς πομπὰς καὶ τοὺς ἀγῶνας*. They  
 35 may have shared the fate of the golden Nikai (F 141). It is, therefore, more likely that F 181 is taken from the fifth book of the *Atthis* and the history of the Thirty (F 143) than from a systematic treatment in one of the special books about cults. When speaking about the vessels, Ph. may have anticipated by recording the later repairs and restorations by

Androtion. The vessels mentioned are those still used in Ph.s own time.

(182) About the Tritopatores see on Phanodemos 325 F 6, who alone says anything about their cult. In regard to the definition of their nature Ph. stands nearer to the anonymous author of the *Exegetikon* (who was hardly Kleidemos) than to Demon's interpretation of them as being the winds <sup>1</sup>). The exegetes introduced the Hesiodic couple Uranos-Gaia, and his Tritopatores carry the names of the Cyclopes. That explained the τρίτος in the name more easily for ancient etymology, but it is a vulgarization which one is surprised to find in an exegetes. Ph., though  
 10 attaching the primeval figures, which were not specifically Athenian but particularly alive in Attica, genealogically to Earth and Sun nevertheless holds to the old belief that the Tritopatores are 'the ancestors', and F 182 is important because it shows the extent and the nature of his theological speculation. Incidentally it establishes for his time the equation of Helios  
 15 with Apollo <sup>2</sup>). We cannot decide whether he regarded the Helios-Apollo at the same time as the (in fact Solonian) Apollo Patroos, and (or) whether he discussed the Tritopatores in the context of the Athenian claim to autochthony.

(183) Hesych. s.v. δειπνοφόροι · παρ' Ἀθηναίους καθίστανται ἐν τῇ τῶν  
 20 Ὀσχοφορίων ἑορτῇ αἱ (Meursius ol M) δειπνοφόροι.. Harpokr. (Suda) s.v. δειπνοφόρος · Ὑπερείδης ἐν τῷ Κατὰ Δημέου <sup>1</sup>). λέγεται δὲ καὶ τὰς δειπνοφόρους καταλέγεσθαι νῦν, ὅτι αἱ τῶν κατακεκλειμένων παιδῶν μητέρες εἰσέ-  
 πεμπον καθ' ἡμέραν αὐτοῖς τροφήν εἰς τὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερόν, ἐν ᾧ διηγιτῶντο, καὶ αὐταὶ συνήιεσαν ἀσπασόμεναι τοὺς ἑαυτῶν. Plutarch *Thes.* 23, 2 ἄγουσι δὲ  
 25 καὶ τὴν τῶν Ὀσχοφορίων ἑορτὴν Θησέως καταστήσαντος ... (4) ... αἱ δὲ δειπνοφόροι παραλαμβάνονται καὶ κοινωνοῦσι τῆς θυσίας <sup>2</sup>), ἀπομιμούμεναι τὰς μητέρας ἐκείνων τῶν λαχόντων · ἐπεφοίτων γὰρ αὐτοῖς ὄψα καὶ σιτία κομιζοῦσαι  
 ... ταῦτα μὲν οὖν καὶ Δήμων (327 F 6) ἱστόρηκεν. *Agora I* 3244 a. 363/2 B.C. (ed. Ferguson *Hesperia* 7 p. 1 ff.; see on F 14/6) v. 41 ff. τὸς ἄρτος ἐς  
 30 Σκιράδος ν / ἔμειν κατὰ τάδε, ἀφελόντας ἐξ ἀπάντων τὸς νομί / ζομένους ἀφαιρεῖσθαι κατὰ τὰ πάτρια · κήρυκι ἄρ / τον, Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερεῖαι ἄρτον, Ἑρακλέος ἱερεῖ ἄρτο / ν, Πανδρόσο καὶ Ἀγλαύρο ἱερεῖαι ἄρτον, Κοροτρό / φο καὶ καλαθηφόρῳ ἄρτον, κώπαις ἄρτον · τῶν δὲ ἄ / λλων νέμεσθαι τὰ ἡμίσεια ἑκατέρως. ἄρχοντα δὲ κ / ληρῶν ἐμ μέρει παρ' ἑκατέρων ὅστις καταστήσει /  
 35 τὸς ὠσκοφόρος καὶ τὰς δειπνοφόρος μετὰ τῆς ἱε / ρείας καὶ τὸ κήρυκος κατὰ τὰ πάτρια. The deipnophoria is a rite <sup>3</sup>) which by its nature is not confined to a particular festival or a particular deity. We may compare it in this respect, and connect it generally, with the Θεοδαλσῖα and Θεοξένια <sup>4</sup>), which in Rome as Lectisternia belong to the *Graecus ritus* <sup>5</sup>). The rite

may have existed in many cults also outside Athens, either as a regular feature in the cults of certain gods, or on certain occasions, but this particular designation of the ceremony occurs rarely compared with the names of the festivals Theodaisia and Theoxenia: apart from the δειπνοφορικὴ ἑορτῆ in an inscription of Ephesos from Roman times <sup>6</sup>), we know it even in Athens only in the cults of the daughters of Kekrops <sup>7</sup>) and that of Athena Skiras. A difference is obvious at once: in regard to the former our only (anonymous) evidence in the *Lexeis* mentions a δειπνοφορία where anybody may bring food and everybody competes to bring the best <sup>8</sup>); in the cult of Athena Skiras, both in the gentilician cult and in that of the State, deipnophoroi (presumably in a certain number) were appointed <sup>9</sup>) and probably had to bring certain kinds of food. We are not informed about any particulars of the 'mystic' *logos* of the deipnophoria <sup>10</sup>); the usage of the Salaminioi is simply stated as a fact; for that of the Oschophoria Attic general tradition introduced events connected with Theseus' expedition to Crete. All these discrepancies appear to be secondary: the Oschophoria is celebrated for Athena (Skiras), and it is with Athena that the daughters of Kekrops are closely connected. According to the historical aition the deipnophoroi are the mothers of the children destined as sacrifices for the Minotaur, and the daughters of Kekrops according to a tradition sacrificed themselves for their country (F 105). Aglauros and Pandrosos have their own priestess in the cult of the Salaminioi, and if Ferguson's surmise is correct <sup>11</sup>) they became closely connected with Athena (Skiras) also in Salamis. All these facts seem to point to a development from one root, which might be the cult of Aglauros <sup>12</sup>). I have tried to show on F 14/6 that in the *Atthis* Ph. (contradicting Demon) detached the Oschophoria from the Theseus story, explaining its usages by connecting it more closely with the actual Attic cult. We may therefore infer that F 183, which shows no traces of variants or controversy, was probably taken from one of his earlier special books, most likely from *Περὶ ἑορτῶν*, though we cannot exclude *Περὶ τῶν Ἀθήνησιν μυστηρίων* because of the *μυστικὸς λόγος*. It is most regrettable that we do not know what he said about the deipnophoria in the *Atthis*.

35 (184) Serv. Dan. Verg. *A.* 2, 632 *ac ducente deo] secundum eos qui dicunt utriusque sexus participationem habere numina. nam ait Calvus* <sup>1</sup>) . . . . *est etiam in Cypro simulacrum barbatae Veneris, corpore et veste muliebri cum sceptro et natura virili, quod Ἀφρόδιτον vocant, cui viri in veste muliebri, mulieres in virili veste sacrificant.* Hesych. s.v. Ἀφρόδιτος · Θεόφραστος μὲν

τὸν Ἑρμαφρόδιτον φησιν, ὁ δὲ τὰ περὶ Ἀμαθοῦντα γεγραφώς Παίων εἰς ἄνδρα τὴν θεὸν ἐσχηματίσθαι ἐν Κύπρῳ λέγει. *Synag. Lex.* p. 472, 24 Bkr. Ἀφρόδιτος· ὁ Ἑρμαφρόδιτος· παραπλήσιοι δὲ τούτῳ ἄλλοι δαίμονες, Ὀρθάνης, Πρίαπος.

It is not quite clear from the context (and the variant *eandem* ~  
 5 *eandemque* increases the difficulty) whether Ph. was speaking about the androgynous deity of Cyprus or about an Attic cult. The former alternative is, however, far more probable, if only for reasons of the matter <sup>2</sup>). As F 184 is cited from the *Atthis*, and as Ph. obviously is identifying Selene not only with the Cypriot goddess but with Aphrodite generally <sup>3</sup>), this  
 10 would point to a digression of some length about the nature of the goddess such as he inserted in the *Atthis* about Dionysos and presumably about other gods as well <sup>4</sup>). The obvious place would be the institution of the cult, and the occasion in this instance might have been the introduction by king Aigeus of Aphrodite Urania, who was also worshipped  
 15 in Cyprus; for Pausanias knows a discussion about the earliest cult of Aphrodite in Attica <sup>5</sup>). We cannot, of course, achieve certainty, but the fact must have been mentioned in the *Atthis*, and if it was the connexion suggested would be more likely than that with some single fact among  
 20 the numerous mythical and historical relations between Athens and Cyprus <sup>6</sup>). It can at any rate not have occurred in the Theseus story, for Plutarch <sup>7</sup>) calls the report of Paion an ἴδιος περὶ τούτων λόγος (consequently he did not take it from the *Atthis*), and Hesychios compares the same report of Paion with that of Theophrastos, who is talking about Hermaphroditos, whom the lexicographers assumed to be the Aphroditos  
 25 of Aristophanes. We do not know whether Ph. mentioned Hermaphroditos; one would think he did, since he speculated about the androgynous nature of the goddess. In any case, the doubt if Hermaphroditos was worshipped long before the times of Ph. <sup>8</sup>), unfounded from the first according to literary tradition, has been finally settled by the inscription  
 30 of Vari (Anagyrus) which the editors date at the opening of the fourth century: Φανῶ Ἑρμαφρω[δί]τῳ (*sic*) εὐξαμένη <sup>9</sup>).

(185) In this case, too, the *συνουικειῶν* is demonstrably earlier: apart from the authors quoted by Philodemos see for the fifth century Euripid. fr. 944 N<sup>2</sup> καὶ Γαῖα μήτηρ· Ἐστὶν δὲ σ'οὶ σοφοὶ / βροτῶν καλοῦσιν ἡμέ-  
 35 νην ἐν αἰθέρι <sup>1</sup>) and for the Stoa Cornutus *Theol. Graec. Comp.* 28 ἐξῆς δὲ περὶ Δήμητρος καὶ Ἐστίας . . . λεκτέον· ἑκατέρω δ' εἴκειν οὐχ ἕτερα τῆς Γῆς εἶναι κτλ. On the other hand, Empedokles as a witness for the identification is doubtful; Philippson *Herm.* 55, 1920, p. 277 refers the quotation to the preceding passage <sup>2</sup>).

(186) Reitzenstein *G. G. Nachr.* 1906 p. 3 f., as Siebelis and Mueller before him, assigned the fragment to Περὶ ἡμερῶν (F 85/8) with fatal consequences for the conception of that work. Their reasons are futile: if the Atticist Pausanias used Περὶ ἡμερῶν that would be no justification for attributing all his citations to that work, and that no other work can be 'proved' to be the source of the note is no argument at all. Περὶ Ἀλκυῶνος and an explanation of the famous wish βάλε δὴ βάλε κερύλοσ εἶην seems a likely enough suggestion <sup>1</sup>). But even the *Atthis* would be conceivable: Alkyone is according to one version the daughter of Skiron <sup>2</sup>), and it is from this Alkyone that the innermost part of the Corinthian gulf, between the coasts of Boeotia and Megaris, takes the name of Ἀλκυονίδος Ὀάλασσα <sup>3</sup>).

(187) *Lex. rhet.* p. 210, 2 Bkr ἀμφορεύς· κάδος, οἱ δὲ κοινῶς μὲν πᾶν κεράμιον <sup>1</sup>). By παλαιοὶ Ph. cannot mean the authors quoted in Pollux 10, 70 and Athen. 11, 45-46 p. 472 E ff. for κάδος — Anakreon, Herodotos, Kratinos <sup>2</sup>). As the word is not epic, it probably occurred in old Attic cult regulations: Autokleides in his *Exegetikon* (353 F 1) describes a καδίσκος in the cult of Zeus Ktesios. On the basis of Ph.s evidence Chr. Blinkenberg *Herm.* 64, 1929, p. 272 recognized ἀμφορεῖς in the unmetrical v. 4 of the Ps. Simonidean epigram *A. P.* 13, 19 (= F 147 Diehl) as 'an explanatory gloss of the obsolete κάδους'.

(188) The citation in F 188a is certain, although it occurs in the wrong place and although the name has dropped out from the learned scholion p. 15, 3 ff. Schw. It refers to a custom belonging to the cult of Artemis of Agrai which Istros 334 F 19 described in detail. It is difficult to say from which of Ph.s books the fragment is taken: Schwartz' alteration of καίρων to βέρωι (= δευτέρωι) is very tempting, but it appears too uncertain for assigning the quotation confidently to the second book of the *Atthis*. If it derives from this book the story of Theseus and Hippolytos is not the only possibility: Pausan. 1, 19, 6 — χωρίον Ἀγραι καλούμενον καὶ ναὸς Ἀγροτέρας ἐστὶν Ἀρτέμιδος· ἐνταῦθα Ἀρτεμιν πρῶτον θηρεῦσαι λέγουσιν ἐλθοῦσαν ἐκ Δήλου, καὶ τὸ ἀγαλμα διὰ τοῦτο ἔχει τῶρον — seems to indicate that the cult at Agrai was considered to be the earliest cult of this goddess in Attica; then we might conjecture, in this instance too, a systematic digression about Artemis on the occasion of the introduction of her cult <sup>1</sup>). I retain the name of Ph. also in F 188 b in face of the overbold alteration of Schwartz, which is not sufficiently supported by the third scholion p. 14, 6 ff. <sup>2</sup>): the Scholiast enumerates anonymously (οἱ μὲν — ἔλλοι — ἔλλοι) three interpretations of the διαβόητον ζήτημα, and he concludes with citing by name Ph. perhaps because he agreed with that

interpretation. This second citation need not necessarily be taken from the same context, nor even from the same book as that used in the discussion about the cult of Artemis generally and that of the goddess of Agrai in particular. It contains the exegesis of a Euripidean ζήτημα, like F 91 where the anonymous ἐνιοί are followed by a ὡς καὶ Φιλόχορος. We shall therefore not assign it to the *Atthis*; the most probable place of origin seems to be the Πρὸς Ἀσκληπιάδην ἐπιστολή of F 91, or else the Περὶ τραγωιδιῶν σύγγραμμα of F 90. Both these works, which belong to the Περὶ-literature of Προβλήματα and Ζητήματα, were known to the interpreters of Euripides <sup>3</sup>).

(189—190) These fragments certainly come from Περὶ ἡμερῶν. The three days mentioned in F 189 present a certain difficulty because the citation is unduly abbreviated. Decadic days <sup>1</sup>) appear most likely at first sight, for the division of the month into three decades is early <sup>2</sup>). But Athena's birthday falls either on the τρίτη φθίνοντος <sup>3</sup>) or on the τρίτη ἰσαμένου <sup>4</sup>). Even if the former dating is earlier because the τρίτη φθίνοντος is the chief day of the great Panathenaia <sup>5</sup>), we do not arrive at any certainty because in Ph.'s own time the backward counting of the third decade was officially replaced by the counting μετ' εἰκάδα(ς), and we do not know whether he accepted this arrangement in a book concerned with religious dates. The lemma μηνὸς δ' ἰσαμένου does not teach us anything, and in F 190 Ph. treats together two successive days of the same character <sup>6</sup>). To understand this merely as 'the Kallynteria of the nineteenth Thargelion' is impossible if only because of the fact that Ph. and the other authors give two days. Moreover the certain fragments of Περὶ ἡμερῶν refer throughout to the character of the days according to their place in the month, not to festivals or anniversaries which are dealt with in Περὶ ἑορτῶν <sup>7</sup>).

(191) The only certain fact in this fragment is that χρησμὸς ἐδόθη requires a recipient. This could hardly be simply 'the fishers'; we expect a proper name <sup>1</sup>). Tuempel <sup>2</sup>), who altered the text least of all, inferred a Διώνυσος Ἄλιος and a bathing of his cult image in the sea; the recipients of the oracle he assumed to be the Halieis of the Argolis <sup>3</sup>). That can be neither proved nor refuted; oracles occurred in that number in Ph. (T 6), certainly not only, perhaps not even especially, in Περὶ μαντικῆς. But where he is concerned one always starts by looking for an Athenian connexion, and the alteration to Ἀλαιεῖς is as slight as that of τόπωι to πότωι, provided it appears necessary; but that again cannot be proved. A cult of Dionysos in one of the demes would be quite in accord with

F 5/7, and if the oracle orders the wine to be mixed the contents would even agree with the discussion of the invention of Amphiktyon. But it is doubtful whether that is really the sense, *πότωι* being a conjecture, and the epithet 'Αλαϊεύς would rather tell against than favour the assumption that Dionysos is metaphorically used for wine. Toepffer's impressive treatment of the clan of the Kynnidai<sup>4)</sup> leads in quite another direction. Its ancestor Kynnes, son of Apollo and a nymph of Mt. Parnes, instituted the cult of Apollo Kynneios<sup>5)</sup>, and with this cult Krates dealt in *Περὶ τῶν Ἀθήνησι θυσιῶν*<sup>6)</sup>. As he mentions the *θυννεῖον Ἀλῆσι* out of which the cult was financed it becomes almost evident that Athen. 7, 50 p. 297 E must be read with Toepffer: Ἀντίγονος ὁ Καρύστιος ἐν τῷ *Περὶ λέξεως τοῦς Ἀλαικαιέας*<sup>7)</sup> λέγει θυσίαν ἐπιτελοῦντας τῷ Ποσειδῶνι ὑπὸ τῶν θύνων ὥραν κτλ. That would decide in favour of the deme Ἀλαί Αἰξωνίδες. But the context in which F 191 occurred cannot even thus be ascertained; *Περὶ θυσιῶν* would be conceivable, not more. Also the single verse, taken perhaps from an oracle of some length about the cult of the deme, remains unintelligible as to its bearing.

(192) If the special book *Περὶ συμβόλων*, of which we do not possess one fragment, has been rightly connected with the Pythagorean *σύμβολα* and with the *Συναγωγή Ἡρωίδων ἤτοι Πυθαγορικῶν γυναικῶν*<sup>1)</sup> we may assume that the *σύμβολα* and *σύμβολοι* of divination<sup>2)</sup> formed a chapter of the comprehensive work *Περὶ μαντικῆς* like the *ἐγγαστρίμυθοι* F 78, the *ἐμπυροσκοπία* in F 193, and the *διὰ τῶν ψήφων μαντική* in F 195. Early literature does not accurately define the meaning of the word: Pindar *Ol.* 12, 8 f. *σύμβολον δ' οὐπω τις ἐπιχθονίων πιστὸν ἀμφὶ πράξιος ἐσομένης εὔρεν θεόθεν· τῶν δὲ μελλόντων τετύφλωνται φραδαί* uses it generally for any indication of the future; the Aeschylean Prometheus v. 484 ff. distinguishes *τρόπους πολλοὺς μαντικῆς* — dreams, *κληδόνας τε δυσκρίτους . . . ἐνοδίους τε συμβόλους*, flight of birds, *etc.*<sup>3)</sup>; Aristophanes *Av.* 719 f. places alongside of each other (because he certainly feels them to be an interconnected group)<sup>4)</sup> *ὄρνιν τε νομίζετε πάνθ' ὄσα περ περὶ μαντείας διακρίνει* — *φήμη, παρμῶς, ξύμβολος, φωνή, θεράπων, ὄνος*. In a systematic work about divination we expect a definition of the *σύμβολοι* and a delimitation from other kinds of omens, and the scholion on Pindar provides this: according to it Ph. defined the *ξύμβολοι* as being *ἐκ φήμης μαντεῖαι* which might be *κληδόνας* and *παρμῶι*; this obviously means articulate and inarticulate omens<sup>5)</sup>. That seems to be trustworthy particularly because it puts an end to the earlier indiscriminate use of *κληδῶν* and *φήμη*<sup>6)</sup>. The characteristic feature of this species of divination



obviously is the accidental and unexpected nature of the sign. Herodot. 9, 91, 1 does not seem to be quite accurate when making Leutyichides ask the Samian ambassador for his name εἶτε κληδόνος εἶνεκεν θέλων πυθέσθαι εἶτε καὶ κατὰ συντυχίην θεοῦ ποιεῦντος; but again the scholion on 5 Pindar says quite accurately (better than Hesychios' εὐρεῖν; the Scholiast on Aristophanes with ἀνέκειτο gives the result) χρῆσασθαι δὲ αὐτοῖς πρῶτον Δήμητραν. We must assume that according to one version the goddess when looking for her daughter received such a φήμη<sup>7)</sup>. Each species of divination must have an 'inventor', and the Athenian mantis 10 evidently preferred the derivation from the goddess of his native country to others. But it does not surprise us to find a Zeus Kledonios, a Hermes Kledonios<sup>8)</sup>, in Smyrna a Κληδόνων ἱερόν<sup>9)</sup>, and that at Thebes the ἐκ φήμης μαντεία was attached to an altar of Apollo<sup>10)</sup>.

(193) One naturally tries to bring the ἐπ' Ἰσμηνοῦ μαντεία σποδός into 15 connexion with Pausanias' report (9, 11, 7) about the altar of the entirely unique Ἀπόλλων Σπόδιος at Thebes: τοῦ δὲ Ἑρακλείου γυμνάσιον ἔχεται καὶ στάδιον, ἀμφοτέρω ἐπάνωμα τοῦ θεοῦ. ὑπὲρ δὲ τὸν Σωφρονιστῆρα λίθον<sup>1)</sup> βωμός ἐστιν Ἀπόλλωνος ἐπίκλησιν Σποδίου. πεποιήται δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς τέφρας τῶν ἱερείων. 20 μαντικὴ δὲ καθέστηκεν αὐτόθι ἀπὸ κληδόνων<sup>2)</sup>. But a local and a factual 20 difficulty are against the connexion: the former is that Pausanias localizes the temple of Apollo Ismenios on a λόφος ἐν δεξιᾷ τῶν πυλῶν (*scil.* τῶν Ἡλεκτρίδων)<sup>3)</sup> and the precinct to which the altar of Apollo Spodios belongs (it is an altar only, not a temple) ἐν ἀριστεραῖ τῶν πυλῶν ἄς ὀνομάζουσι Ἡλέκτρας<sup>4)</sup>. The factual difficulty is that at the altar of Apollo 25 Spodios the prophesying is ἐκ κληδόνων<sup>5)</sup> (a fact of which there can be no doubt because of the digression about the Κληδόνες at Smyrna following the passage transcribed in the Text), at the altar of Apollo Ismenios διὰ τῶν ἐμπύρων. Thus Ph., and other witnesses at least do not 30 contradict<sup>6)</sup>. Consequently the assumption of a confusion in the scholion 30 appears out of the question. Holleaux<sup>7)</sup> presented a thesis according to which Pausanias' often repeated assertion of his autopsy of Thebes was mere humbug, which in this case as in others led him to 'a bad piece of nonsense', for he assigned to Apollo Spodios a place of oracle of his own whereas in fact the altar of Spodios belonged to the Ismenion and Apollo 35 Ismenios was identical with Apollo Spodios. But in carrying the thesis through Holleaux burdened it with such grave misinterpretations that I believe it to be far more improbable in principle than the assumption of an error of Sophokles who perhaps was not sufficiently informed about Theban topography. At the utmost I should concede a carelessness on the

part of Pausanias, who (interested as he is here in the κληδόνες) may have overlooked the fact that at the altar of Apollo Spodios ἐμπυρομαντεία was also practised besides other kinds of divination<sup>8)</sup>. But as the former is expressly attested for Ismenios we had perhaps better keep the two cults 5 entirely apart. In any case, F 193 is most probably part of the treatment of empyromancy<sup>9)</sup> in the work Περὶ μαντικῆς; if Ph. mentioned Apollo Spodios too (we do not know that he did) it was in the chapter about the ἐκ φήμης μαντεῖαι from which F 192 derives.

(194) Hesych. s.v. νηφάλια ξύλα · τὰ μὴ ἀμπέλινα ἢ συκάμινα ἢ σύκινα (μη  
10 ἄ. μήτε σύκινα μήτε μύρινα Phot. Sud. s.v.) · ἐκεῖνα γὰρ οἰνόσπονδα λέ-  
γεται. Pollux 6, 26 τὸ γὰρ νηφαλιεύειν τὸ νηφάλια θύειν ἔλεγον, ὅπερ ἐστὶ  
τὸ χρῆσθαι θυσίαις αἰνοῖσι, ὧν τὰς ἐναντίας θυσίας οἰνοσπόνδους ὠνόμαζον.  
Hesych. s.v. νηφάλιοι · . . ἢ θύματα καὶ βωμοί, ἐφ' ὧν οἶνος οὐ σπένδεται.  
Phot. Sud. s.v. νηφάλιοι θυσίαι · ἐν αἷσι οἶνος οὐ σπένδεται, ἀλλ' ὕδωρ καὶ  
15 μελίκρατον (ἀλλ' — μελ. Lex. rhet. p. 282, 31 Bkr; καὶ om. Suda s.v.;  
Eustath. Od. δ 228). Et. M. p. 605, 32 νηφάλια λέγουσι θύειν ὅταν ὕδωρ  
ἐπισπένδωσιν. Phot. Lex. s.v. νηφάλια · θύματα δίχα σπονδῆς. Theophrast.  
in Porphyg. De abst. 2, 20 τὰ μὲν ἀρχαῖα τῶν ἱερῶν νηφάλια παρὰ πολλοῖς  
ἦν (νηφάλια δ' ἐστὶν τὰ ὑδρόσπονδα), τὰ δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα μελίσπονδα . . . εἶτ'  
20 ἐλαιόσπονδα, τέλος δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσιν τὰ ὕστερον γεγονότα οἰνόσπονδα.

About the θυσίαι νηφάλιαι see the full treatment of Ziehen R. E. XVI  
2, 1935, col. 2481 ff. His brief article about ξύλα v. *ibid.* col. 2489 no. 2  
is insufficient as to the matter: the question about the species of wood  
ought to have been gone into; the lexicographers do not quite agree with  
25 F 194; also the contention about the particular position of the θύμον ought  
to have been examined (was it merely founded on etymological specu-  
lation?). About the probable assignment of the quotation from Ph. to the  
special book Περὶ θυσιῶν see on F 12. It is from that work that Didymos  
corrected Krates, who either really was less accurate, or represents the  
30 usage of a later period which forbade for the νηφάλια only the wood of  
the vine. We should like to know whether Ph. assumed the same devel-  
opment concerning the θυσίαι that we find in Theophrastos, and how  
the two authors are related chronologically. But there certainly existed  
earlier sacred rules, if only in the *Exegetika*. It is uncertain whether the  
35 concluding sentence about θυσίαι τὸ παράπαν ἄσπονδοι is still Ph.; the  
evidence which he cannot have omitted would have yielded interesting  
specialities of cult, and presumably 'historical' aitia as well. These matters  
can be imagined as resembling the reason given for the sacrifice of ἐργάται  
βούς in the cult of Apollo Spodios (on F 193) · καὶ ποτε παρούσης σφίσι τῆς

εορτῆς ἢ τε ὥρα κατήπειγε τῆς θυσίας, καὶ οἱ πεμφθέντες ἐπὶ τὸν ταῦρον οὐχ ἦγον κτλ. (Pausan. 9, 12, 1).

- (195) *Lex. rhet.* p. 265, II Bkr Θριάσιον πεδίον· τόπου ὄνομα· ἐκλήθη δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν βληθεισῶν εἰς αὐτὸ θριῶν ὑπ' Ἀθηναῖς· θρίαὶ δὲ εἰσιν αἱ μαντικαὶ ψῆφοι. Νύμφαι δὲ τινες, Θρίαὶ ὀνομαζόμεναι, ἐξεῦρον τὴν τοιαύτην μαντείαν· ἦσαν δὲ Ἀπόλλωνος τιθηνοί· ὅθεν καὶ τὸ μαντεύεσθαι θριάσθαι. Steph. Byz. s.v. Θρία· δῆμος τῆς Οἰνηίδος φυλῆς . . . θριαὶ δὲ αἱ μαντικαὶ ψῆφοι \* \* ἦν (ο, scil. τὴν διὰ τῶν ψήφων μαντικὴν) ἐφεῦρεν (ἐφερεν ο εὔρεν Mei) Ἀθηναῖ· ἀχθομένου δὲ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος<sup>1)</sup> ἄπιστον ὁ Ζεὺς (ὁ Ζ. om. R) ἐποίησε τὴν διὰ τῶν θριῶν μαντικὴν εὐδοχιμοῦσαν (εὐδόκιμον οὔσαν R)· διὸ καὶ Ἀπόλλων ἔφη «πολλοὶ θριοβόλοι (-λον ο), παῦροι δὲ τε μάντιες (μάντινες ο) ἄνδρες». ἔστι δὲ (om. P) καὶ δῆμος Θριῶν ἀπὸ Θριάντος. Et. M. p. 455, 34 (Et. gen. p. 160 Mi)<sup>2)</sup> Θρίαὶ· αἱ μαντικαὶ ψῆφοι, οἰονεὶ τρίαὶ τινὲς οὔσαι· καὶ γὰρ αἱ τρεῖς νύμφαι αἱ θυγατέρες τοῦ Διὸς<sup>3)</sup> εὐρηκυῖαι τρεῖς ψήφους μαντικὰς παρέσχον τῇ Ἀθηναί, ἣτις ἐγκαλουμένη ὡς ἀλλότριον πρᾶγμα μετιοῦσα (τοῦτο γὰρ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνός ἐστιν) ἔρριψεν αὐτάς εἰς τὸ λεγόμενον Θριάσιον πεδίον. — παρὰ τὸ τρία γέγονε θρία καὶ Θριάσιον· ἐκεῖ γὰρ ἔρριψεν ἢ Ἀθηναῖ τὰς μαντικὰς ψήφους, αἵτινες θρίαὶ λέγονται· ὅθεν καὶ τὸ μαντεύεσθαι θριάσθαι λέγεται, καὶ αὐτὰ τρεῖς εἰσὶ τὸν ἀριθμὸν. — ἢ παρὰ τὸ τρισσαί· ἢ ἀπὸ Θριασίου (Hemst θριάσου V θρασίου γ) τινὸς οὕτως καλουμένου. Hesych. s.v. Θριαί· αἱ πρῶται μάντιες· καὶ νύμφαι· καὶ αἱ μαντικαὶ ψῆφοι. Ibid. s.v. θριάζειν· φυλλολογεῖν, ἐνθουσιᾶν, ἐνθουσιάζειν· Εὐριπίδης Λικυμνίωι ((F 478 N<sup>2)</sup>) καὶ Σοφοκλῆς Ὀδυσσεὶ Μαινομένωι (F 428 N<sup>2</sup>). Kyrrill. *Lex.* (Cramer *An. Par.* IV 184, 1) s.v. θρία· φύλλα συκῆς ἢ ἀμπέλου, ὡς Ἀπολλόδωρος<sup>4)</sup>.
- 25 Hom. *Hym. Herm.* 552 Θριαὶ (Hermann σεμναὶ M μοῖραι γ) γὰρ τινὲς εἰσι κασιγνηταὶ γεγαυῖαι, / παρθένοι ὠκείησι ἀγαλλόμεναι πτερυγεσσι / τρεῖς· κατὰ δὲ κρατὸς πεπαλαγμένοι ἄλφιτα λευκὰ / οἰκία ναιετάουσιν ὑπὸ πτυχι Παρνησοῖο, / μαντείης ἀπάνευθε διδάσκαλοι, ἦν ἐπὶ (διδασκαλίαν ἐπὶ M) βουσί / παῖς ἔτ' ἐὼν μελέτησα, πατὴρ δ' ἐμὸς οὐκ ἀλέγιζεν (Hermann 30 ἀλέγυεν, -εινεν ο)· / ἐντεῦθεν δὴ ἔπειτα ποτῶμεναι ἄλλοτε ἄλλῃ (Schneidewin ἄλλοτ' ἐπ' ἄλλῃ ο) / κηρία βόσκονται καὶ τε κραινοῦσιν ἕκαστα. / αἱ δὲ ὅτε μὲν θυίωσιν (M θυίσωσιν, θύσωσι γ) ἐδηδυῖαι μέλι χλωρὸν / προφρονέως ἐθέλουσιν ἀληθείην ἀγορεύειν· / ἦν δ' ἀπονοσφισθῶσι θεῶν ἠδείαν ἐδωδῆν, / ψεύδονται δὴ ἔπειτα δι' ἀλλήλων δονέουσαι. / τὰς τοι ἔπειτα 35 δίδωμι κτλ. 5). Kallimach. *Hym. Ap.* 45 κείνου (scil. Ἀπόλλωνος) δὲ θριαὶ καὶ μάντιες. *Id.* F 260, 50 Pf. (*Hekale*) [ὡς] Θριαὶ τὴν γρῆν ἐπιπνεῖουσι κορώνην.
- The traditions about the Thriai need discriminating<sup>6)</sup>. As far as we can see Ph. discussed thrioboly simply as a form of prophecy, and then most probably in a chapter of *Περὶ μαντικῆς*. No straight line leads thence

to the explanation of the name of the deme Thria 7). The *μαντικά ψῆφοι* are treated in exactly the same fashion as the *ἐκ φήμης μαντεῖαι* F 192, for whom Ph. also knows a divine 'inventor'. The Thriai of Parnassos are not opposed to Apollo, for they are called his *τροφοί*, but no connexion is established between them and Delphi; anyone believing in an original oracle by lot-throwing in Delphi must not cite Ph. as attesting it 8). So far Ph. obviously gives the version of the Homeric hymn, nor is there any reason to doubt his having known it. On the other hand, the hymn treats the divination of the Thriai with a kind of goodnatured scorn, as a lower stage of divination, accentuating its uncertainty, and that evidently was Delphic theology 9), whereas Ph. (always as far as we can see) reports facts objectively as we expect in a systematic work. But in the definition a real difference stands out: *ψῆφοι*, according to the ordinary interpretation, are pebbles; a *διὰ τῶν ψήφων μαντική* is definitely different from the prophesying of the Thriai as described in the hymn, where the *ἀγορεύειν* alongside of *δονέουσαι* can only mean the buzzing of the bees 10). To follow up the beliefs concerning bees and generally to discuss the factual questions involved 11) would, of course, lead us too far afield. But if we may trust the sound-looking, though succinct, excerpt from Ph. only one explanation seems possible: the prophecy of the Thriai on Parnassos has passed through a development in the interval between the hymn to Hermes and Ph.; the quite primitive interpretation of the bees' buzzing was replaced by a form of divination also ancient, but wide-spread still in historical times, which was more satisfactory and at the same time more convenient for a person in need of divine advice 12). In the second story, that of the *ἔλλοι*, the most important point is the connexion of the Thriai with Athena; this involves either their having been moved from Parnassos to Attica or their having existed as a form of divination also in Attica, where the deme Thria and the Thriasian plain are said to have been called after them. In this story Delphi plays a part merely in so far as the antagonism between the two species of divination is emphasized even more strongly. The Attic story seems to have existed in two versions, one of which Wiliamowitz assigned to Demon with a fair amount of probability 13). According to the first version, preserved only in the rather badly mutilated article of Stephanos of Byzantium, Athena herself invents *τὴν διὰ τῶν ψήφων μαντικὴν*, and Apollo makes a direct appeal to his father Zeus concerning the inconvenient rival; Zeus, though according to Pherekydes the father of the Thriai, makes their oracle deceptive 14), and Apollo expresses his satisfaction in the saw for

the explanation of which Zenobios gives the story. The part Athena plays in this version is not exactly brilliant, and I believe that a later Athenian author felt this and substituted the second version (Lexeis; Et.). According to it the Thriai make the invention and offer it to Athena, but, 5 mirror of honour that she is, she refuses to encroach on her brother's privileges and throws the 'pebbles' away into the plain of Thria. This last trait of the second version is regarded, generally and probably rightly, as an imitation of the story about the invention of the flute, and it did not yet occur in Demon <sup>15</sup>). I do not wish wantonly to deny the 10 existence of Attic Thriai, though neither Pherekydes nor Kallimachos is quite certain evidence for them <sup>16</sup>). But the 'historical explanations' of Demon seldom are very valuable, and they often are demonstrably autoschediasms; the possibility that the Attic Thriai, whose occurrence in Ph. can at least not be proved <sup>17</sup>), owe their existence only to the name 15 of the deme or of the plain, must, in my opinion, not be neglected.

Later on Apollodoros applied his explanatory principles <sup>18</sup>) to the Thriai or to their kind of prophecy. He rejected the mythical derivations, both the Delphic tale given in the Hymn and reported by Ph. and the (auto-schediastic?) Attic one from Thrias(ios), and worked with etymology 20 to the exclusion of all other means, connecting the θριαί (Θρίαί) with θρίων 'fig-leaf', as others had connected as least the name with the number τρεῖς. In that sense we must probably understand the fragment quoted above which unfortunately is so brief that we cannot even say whether he dealt with the Parnassian or the Attic Thriai, or whether he 25 had any material reasons for believing that leaves (twigs) of fig-trees had ever been used in their divination.

(196) For the jurisdiction of the Areopagos περί πάντων σχεδόν σφαλμάτων καὶ παρανομιῶν Ph. is quoted together with Androtion as is usual where historical and political facts are concerned: F 3-4 and F 20 from the 30 second and the third books of the *Atthis* deal with the reign of Kekrops and the legislation of Solon. The singularity of the juxtaposition with Phanodemos makes it appear improbable that F 196 belongs to the same context. The contents of Athenaios' ch. 65 (an anecdote about the investigation by the Areopagos in the case of Menedemos and Asklepiades 35 whom they asked πῶς ἔλας τὰς ἡμέρας τοῖς φιλοσόφοις συσχολάζοντες, κεκτημένοι δὲ μηδὲν κτλ., followed by another about public proceedings in Abdera against Demokritos ὡς κατεφθαρκότα τὰ πατρῷα) rather point to the time of Demetrios of Phaleron, not covered by Androtion's *Atthis* any more but treated fully by Ph. in his books seven and eight. We do  
 Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.) 36

- not gain much by stating this, for the collective citation does not allow of recognizing with certainty whether the reference is to the well-known νόμος ἀργίας <sup>1)</sup>, nor whether more than the statement about the privilege of the Areopagos should be assigned to the Atthidographers. The ἄλλοι πλείους may include biographers who started from this statement, or collections like that of Hegesandros who is cited in ch. 64 for the ἀσωτία of one Δημήτριος Δημητρίου ἀπόγονος <sup>2)</sup>. Τὸ παλαιόν at any rate does not belong to Ph., who uses this term in reference to primeval times and to the period of the kings, but to Athenaios or to his intermediate source.
- 10 It would be rash to assign to Ph. even one of the anecdotes, for although the alleged chronological error is of minor importance <sup>3)</sup> the residence of Menedemos in Athens for the purpose of studying is quite uncertain; it may be due to a confusion with Menedemos of Pyrrha <sup>4)</sup>. If that is so, the contemporary Ph. cannot be believed capable of such a mistake.
- 15 (197) Aristot. Ἀθ. 49, 4 δοκιμάζει δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἀδυνάτους ἢ βουλή· νόμος γάρ ἐστιν ὃς κελεύει τοὺς ἐντὸς τριῶν μνῶν κεκτημένους καὶ τὸ σῶμα πεπρωμένους, ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι μηδὲν ἔργον ἐργάζεσθαι, δοκιμάζειν μὲν τὴν βουλὴν, δίδοναι δὲ δημοσίαι τροφήν δύο ὀβολοὺς ἐκάστωι τῆς ἡμέρας· καὶ ταμίαις ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς κληρωτός. Hesych. s.v. ἀδύνατοι· οἱ ἐντὸς κεκτημένοι
- 20 τριῶν <μνῶν> (suppl. Schmidt) παρὰ Ἀττικοῖς· ἐλάμβανον δὲ παρὰ τῆς βουλῆς δύο ὀβολοὺς. Schol. Aischin. I, 103 κατὰ μῆνα ἐκ τοῦ δημοσίου (suppl. Rei) δίδονται τοῖς ἀδυνάτοις πολίταις μισθός. ἀδυνάτους δὲ πάντας λέγουσι τοὺς ὀπωσθηποτοῦν ἠχρειωμένους πρὸς ἐπικουρίαν αὐτῶν. ἄλλως· τοῖς ἀδυνάτοις τοῖς σώμασιν ἐχορηγεῖτο ἐκάστης ἡμέρας ἐκ τοῦ δημοσίου τριῶβλον . . . νόμος γὰρ ἦν Σόλωνος ὁ κελεύων τοὺς τοιοῦτους ἐκ τῶν δημοσίων τρέφεσθαι. Plutarch. Solon 31, 3 καὶ νόμους αὐτὸς (Peisistratos) ἐτέρους ἔγραψεν, ὧν ἐστὶ καὶ ὁ τοὺς πηρωθέντας ἐν πολέμῳ δημοσίαι τρέφεσθαι κελεύων· (4) τοῦτο δὲ φησὶν Ἡρακλείδης (F 19 Voss) καὶ πρότερον ἐπὶ Θερασίππῳ πηρωθέντι τοῦ Σόλωνος ψηφισαμένου μιμήσασθαι τὸν Πει-
- 30 σίστρατον.

In the article of Harpokration an excerpt from Aristotle is followed by one from an Atthidographer as is almost the rule. As the latter (remarkably enough) also seems to have confined himself to giving the state of things in his own time the lexicographer adds the evidence of a speech by

35 Lysias which Blass <sup>1)</sup> dated 'some time later than 403 B.C.'. This evidence provides the history of the institution roughly speaking during the fourth century: it is true, the dole was doubled (and this must have happened under the administration of Lykurgos at the latest), but it remained far less than the allowance for the Assembly which early in the century had

been quickly increased from one to three obols, later on to a drachm,  
 and then to a drachm and a half <sup>2)</sup>. The commuting of the daily dole into  
 nine drachms per month <sup>3)</sup>, which took place after 306/5 B.C. when the  
 month and the prytany coincided (in ordinary years at least) <sup>4)</sup>, even meant  
 5 a reduction of between eight and eighteen drachms in the year; as there  
 was a general increase of prices this measure must have told rather severely  
 on the recipients of the dole <sup>5)</sup>. The dole which was meant to guarantee  
 a minimum livelihood, only food being taken into account, was paid  
 not per day but per prytany <sup>6)</sup> even before 306/5 B.C., but in the earlier  
 10 time the amount was evidently calculated accurately according to the  
 number of days <sup>7)</sup> as is natural when one considers the wide differences  
 in the length of a prytany in ordinary and intercalated years. For the  
 state of our tradition it is again typical that we are quite ignorant in regard  
 to the institution during the fifth century, our sources leaping back to  
 15 its introduction at once. It is not surprising that they assign the law to  
 Solon <sup>8)</sup>, but in his time a social measure as sweeping as the Scholiast on  
 Aischines reports <sup>9)</sup> is plainly impossible. The evidence of Plutarch, who  
 confines the dole to those disabled in war is, however, subject to doubts  
 as well. The passage is taken from the discussion of measures as to which  
 20 there was a controversy whether they belonged to Solon or to Peisi-  
 stratos <sup>10)</sup>, and we understand how comprehensive that discussion must  
 have been to which Herakleides of Pontos evidently hoped to put an end  
 by a compromise. The term τοὺς πηρωθέντας shows that there was one  
 law only to which all our evidence refers, and this fact in itself rouses  
 25 suspicion against the surplus ἐν πολέμοι. I cannot share the confidence  
 with which it is generally assumed that it was Peisistratos who introduced  
 pensions for the war-disabled while the extension to all disabled persons  
 belongs to a later time which cannot be accurately determined <sup>11)</sup>. I dislike  
 doubting a peculiarity of Athens, and will admit *argumenti causa* that we  
 30 cannot arrive at any certainty because we know nothing of Thersippos <sup>12)</sup>,  
 but a pension for the war-disabled appears to me as impossible for the  
 time of Peisistratos as for that of Solon; I have not the least doubt that  
 the provision for the ἀδύνατοι is one of the social measures which is  
 characteristic of the period of Perikles. It is conceivable that the number  
 35 of war-disabled men, which must have been considerable at that time,  
 furnished the occasion, but the fact remains that the pension was for  
 all disabled and that those disabled in war did not enjoy a preference  
 such as e.g. a higher payment. The 'Solonian' law speaks simply of  
 ἀδύνατοι <sup>13)</sup>, and if my suggestion is correct this means that a provision

which had been decided upon for the war-disabled was at once extended to all those who were physically unable to earn their living. In Plutarch the words ἐν πολέμοις are either the interpolation of an over-wise reader, or the discussion mentioned above took into account the provision for 5 war-orphans, and either used it as an argument for Solon as the author of the law about the ἀδύνατοι, or simply confused the two measures.

(198) The passage is severely cut down and in consequence inaccurate. Nothing is said about the eventful history of this office, into which even Aristotle by way of exception briefly enters as far as the first of his 10 γραμματεῖς was concerned. Aristotle does not use the designation ἀντιγραφεὺς, he talks of two clerks to the Council <sup>1)</sup> whom he distinguishes as τὸν κατὰ πρυτανεῖαν καλούμενον and ἐπὶ τοὺς νόμους ἕτερον; the name ἀντιγραφεὺς seems to have been developed by the grammarian from the duties of the first named <sup>2)</sup>. The business of the ἀντιγραφεὺς ἐπὶ τῆς διοικησεως 15 κήσεως certainly was what Aischin. 3, 25 says about the 'former' ἀντιγραφεὺς χειροτονητὸς τῆι πόλει, ὃς καθ' ἑκάστην πρυτανεῖαν ἀπελογίζετο τὰς προσόδους τῶι δήμωι; that is Aristotle's γραμματεὺς ὁ κατὰ πρυτανεῖαν who πρότερον ἦν χειροτονητὸς <sup>3)</sup>. On the other hand, the title given by Ph. to his ἀντιγραφεὺς (if we may trust the lexicographer) seems to point to a 20 time when the office ὁ (οἱ) ἐπὶ τῆι διοικήσει<sup>4)</sup> existed. Epigraphic evidence for this office is not earlier than 307/6 B.C. <sup>5)</sup>, though it is frequently ascribed to the time of Demetrios of Phaleron. F 198 therefore either belongs to books seven to eight, or eight to nine of the *Atthis*.

(199) Pollux 8, 53 χίλιοι δὲ κατὰ μὲν τὸν Σόλωνα τὰς εἰσαγγελίας ἐκρινον, κατὰ δὲ τὸν Φαληρέα καὶ πρὸς πεντακόσιοι. The article about the 25 εἰσαγγελία <sup>1)</sup> is divisible into two sections: (1) the definition, *i.e.* in what cases this procedure was instituted; (a) according to Caecilius whose definition the lexicographer repeats at the end of his article in a quotation verbatim although not complete, which seems to be the basis of 30 Harpokration as well <sup>2)</sup>; (b) according to Theophrastos whose definition the lexicographer apparently approves because Krateros' statement about the earliest documentary case seemed to confirm that definition in his opinion <sup>3)</sup>; (c) according to the incorrect usage of the orators, who applied the term also in the case of crimes which do not fall under the 35 νόμος εἰσαγγελτικὸς <sup>4)</sup>. (2) The procedure. This section is corrupt in the opening and seems to be incomplete in other parts as well <sup>5)</sup>. For the number of the judges, which obviously applies to cases of high treason only, Ph. and Demetrios of Phaleron (probably from Κατὰ τῆς Ἀθήνησι νομοθεσίας) are cited alongside of each other, as more often Aristotle



(whose 'Αθπ. fails us in this instance) and an Atthidographer; for the concluding words ὡς δὲ Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς as well as Pollux' Κατὰ τὸν Φαληρέα probably are a quotation <sup>6)</sup>, just as κατὰ Σόλωνα may be either a statement of the time or a reference to Solon's code of laws. It is certain  
 5 that there is no difference of opinion between Demetrios and Ph. as to the matter; they merely have in view different times (rather than different cases). It remains uncertain in regard to Ph. whether he is referring to the time of Solon as one might conclude from Pollux, in regard to Demetrios whether it was he who introduced the increased number of  
 10 judges. These questions are in some degree connected. For Aristotle also knows a Solonian νόμος εισαγγελίας, but he gives the Areopagos as the judging authority <sup>7)</sup>, and we expect that at least the better Atthidographers did not follow the orators in treating any Athenian law whatever as Solonian but were aware of the differences between the legislation of  
 15 594/3 and that of 403/2 B.C. <sup>8)</sup>. Apart from that they must have known a certain number of individual cases, laws, and psephisms referring to the procedure <sup>9)</sup>. Ph. must have realized that the Areopagos lost the privilege of judging high treason in 462/1 B.C. at the latest, but we cannot tell for certain whether that was the date when they lost it formally; or (to  
 20 express it differently) whether Ph. had a date for the introduction of the νόμος εισαγγελτικός, whether that law occurred already in the code of 403/2 B.C., and whether it furnished the normal number of 1000 judges. The work of Demetrios, on the other hand, is almost certainly meant as an accompaniment and 'public justification' of his own legislation <sup>10)</sup>;  
 25 in this case he would be not only the authority for the increase of the number (*Lex.*), but also the author of it (Pollux?). But as Deinarchos in the speech Κατὰ Δημοσθένους (§ 52), delivered in 324 B.C., mentions an eisangelia ἐν πεντακοσίοις καὶ δισχιλίοις, and as the correct emendation of the certainly corrupt figure is uncertain, this remains doubtful. With  
 30 the material at our disposal we cannot arrive at any definite answer to the questions when the normal number of 1000 was introduced and when it was increased to 1500 <sup>11)</sup>, even apart from the main questions at what time the procedure of εισαγγελία was prescribed for certain crimes, and when the νόμος εισαγγελτικός was enacted, which was valid in the second  
 35 half of the fourth century <sup>12)</sup>. The place of F 199 in the *Atthis* therefore cannot be determined.

(200) The Scholiast, in order to explain the playful verses γλαῦκες ὑμᾶς οὐποτ' ἐπιλείψουσι Λαυρειωτικάι, / ἀλλ' ἐνοικήσουσιν ἔνδον, ἐν τε τοῖς βαλλαντίοις / ἐννεοττεύσουσι κάκλέψουσι μικρὰ κέρματα, uses probably

the *Atthis* of Philochoros who had described the Athenian tetradrachmon, the standard coin even in his own time, which most probably had been introduced by Peisistratos <sup>1</sup>). He did this in one of those comprehensive digressions which treat under a fixed date a development of some duration, in this instance that of the Athenian state-coinage. The earlier standard coin of the State, according to him, was the didrachm having for its type a bull <sup>2</sup>), which can only mean the whole animal, not a bull's head such as is found on some of the so-called heraldic coins and which may, or may not, have been the badge of the Eteobutad family <sup>3</sup>). For this coin Ph. mentions one stamp only, apparently the obverse, and numismatical evidence tends to show that this is not due to negligence or omission, but to actual knowledge; for the early Athenian coins were in fact without a reverse type, the punch stamped on the reverse being cross-cut with lines in a certain pattern <sup>4</sup>). So one is at first inclined also to place confidence in his statement about the type of the older standard coin; and if there really exists at least one Athenian didrachmon with a 'bull to the left' on the obverse and a pattern on the reverse <sup>5</sup>), we should have to infer that Ph. had seen such coins (wherever he did so) or knew (from whatever source) that the 'bulls' had been in circulation at Athens before the 'owls'. But as the Athenian origin of this one bull coin—which Seltman calls 'the most interesting of all the Eupatrid didrachms', and which he assigns to the period between Solon and Peisistratos, perhaps c. 580 B.C.—appears to be extremely doubtful <sup>6</sup>), we have to admit that we remain in the dark as to the basis of the tradition, if tradition it was <sup>7</sup>). On the other hand, it is clear at once from the wording of the scholion that Ph.—whether rightly or wrongly is a moot point <sup>8</sup>)—regarded the bull coins as the official money issued by the State; and as in declaring that the old standard coin was a didrachm he agrees with Aristotle, we may reasonably conclude that Androtion had said so too <sup>9</sup>).

But Ph. is certainly wrong in assuming (as he seems to have done) that all didrachms had the same type, for we know (though Ph. probably did not) that there were many other types on Athenian coins of the sixth century B.C., conveniently collected, classified, and explained by Seltman in his most stimulating book <sup>10</sup>)—the amphora, the Alcmeonid trisceles, the (Eteobutad?) bull's head, the beetle, *etc.* Leaving aside this fact we may safely assume that Ph., when speaking about Athenian coinage, followed Androtion whose account of the activity of Solon in this province underlies also the famous chapter 10 of Aristotle's *'Αθην.*; the question is only how far Ph. was guided by Androtion: we cannot be

positive that the latter, too, mentioned the types of the old and the new coins (though I think it most probable that he did), because Aristotle omitted the details of Solon's monetary reform as not pertinent to his purpose. But as the usual relationship between the two Atthidographers is proved to hold good here by their parallel statements about the old standard coin — τῶν προτέρων διδράχμων ὄντων (Ph.) ~ ἦν δ' ὁ ἀρχαῖος χαρᾶκτηρ διδραχμον (Aristotle) — it is clear at least that Ph. followed Andro-  
 5 in dealing with the monetary reform under the year of Solon 594/3 B.C.; and then we may safely infer that both ascribed to Solon not only  
 10 the change of the standard coin and the simultaneous reduction of its weight, but also its new type. This mistake<sup>11</sup>) I will not explain by the usual (and often wrong) expedient, an appeal to the 'democratic tone of the chronicle'; I regard it simply as an almost inevitable consequence  
 15 of weights, measures, and currency brought about by Solon in the year of his archonship<sup>12</sup>). In any case, it seems certain to me that Andro-  
 20 tion and Ph.—probably not being aware of the fact that Athenian sixth century coins show a variety of types, nor of the possible explanation for it, the issuing of money by the several clans—made one simple distinction  
 between old and new money<sup>13</sup>), the former being in their opinion the pre-Solonian currency, heavy didrachms with the obverse type of a bull, the latter the post-Solonian, lighter tetradrachms with the head of Athena on the obverse and the sacred owl on the reverse.

That being so we not only learn incidentally that in the opinion of the  
 25 Atthidographers there never was a foreign currency in Athens<sup>14</sup>), but we can proceed a step further in the reconstruction of Ph.'s theory, steering clear of the 'knotty problem of Solon's reform of currency'. This difficult question, or rather bundle of questions about the actual facts of the reform—what currency there was in Athens before Solon; what  
 30 reasons he had for changing it; what name he gave to his standard coin; what its weight was; what type(s) he struck; what system he followed, and so on—I leave wholly to the experts<sup>15</sup>). We have only to do here with the opinion of Ph. about the reform. If he simply distinguished  
 35 between old and new money, bull coins and owl coins, didrachms and tetradrachms, and if he ascribed the introduction of the latter to Solon, it is again safe to assume that he raised the further question who it was introduced the bull money and, incidentally, invented Athenian coinage. It would be almost inconceivable that Atthidographers should not have raised this question and, in fact, we know from the *Heuremata* that

they did raise it. Now the most obvious answer is furnished by Plutarch. *Thes.* 25, 3<sup>16</sup>): ἔκοψε δὲ καὶ νόμισμα (*scil.* ὁ Θησεύς), βοῦν ἐγχαράξας ἢ διὰ τὸν Μαραθῶνιον ταῦρον ἢ διὰ τὸν Μίνω στρατηγὸν ἢ πρὸς γεωργίαν τοὺς πολίτας παρακαλῶν· ἀπ' ἐκείνου δὲ φασὶ τὸ ἑκατόμβιον καὶ τὸ δεκάβοιον 5 ὀνομασθῆναι. Without diving deeper into the question of sources<sup>17</sup>), it is abundantly clear that Plutarch derives finally from a disquisition on early Athenian coinage similar to, or identical with, the one used by Pollux 9, 60/1 τὸ παλαιὸν δὲ τοῦτο (*scil.* τὸ δίδραχμον) ἦν Ἀθηναίους νόμισμα, καὶ ἔκαλετο βοῦς ὅτι βοῦν εἶχεν ἐντετυπωμένον. εἰδέναι δὲ αὐτὸ καὶ Ὅμηρον 10 νομίζουσιν εἰπόντα «ἑκατόμβοι ἑνεαβοίων» (*Il.* Z 236). καὶ μὴν κὰν τοῖς Δράκοντος νόμοις ἔστιν ἀποτίνειν εἰκοσάβοιον<sup>18</sup>), καὶ ἐν τῇ παρὰ Δηλίοις θεωρίᾳ τὸν κήρυκα κηρύττειν φασίν, ὅποτε δωρεὰ τινι δίδοται, ὅτι βόες τοσοῦτοι δοθῆσονται αὐτῷ, καὶ δίδοσθαι καθ' ἕκαστον βοῦν δύο δραχμάς Ἀττικὰς, ὅθεν ἔνιοι Δηλίων ἀλλ' οὐκ Ἀθηναίων ἴδιον εἶναι νόμισμα τὸν βοῦν 15 νομίζουσιν. ἐντεῦθεν δὲ καὶ τὴν παροιμίαν εἰρησθαι τὴν ἴβους ἐπὶ γλώσση βέβηκεν', εἰ τις ἐπ' ἀργυρίῳ σιωπήσειεν<sup>19</sup>). If we put together what evidence there is we get a perfectly clear history of Athenian coinage as visualized by the Atthidographers, and one which is moreover in perfect accordance with their usual procedure when dealing with the introduction 20 of new institutions in (for us and for them) prehistoric times and their development in historic times, a history not biassed by the political conviction of their authors (such as is apparent *e.g.* in Androtion's explanation of the *σεισάχθεια*), but based partly on tradition (about Solon's reforms) and documentary evidence (in the form of old coins extant, 25 perhaps, in the fourth century), partly on historical or pseudo-historical speculation. For Aristotle (Androtion), Ph., Pollux the early standard coin is the didrachm; for Ph., Plutarch, Pollux its type is the bull and the earliest money is the ox-coin; for Pollux there is a real connexion between the type of the coin and the value of the beast stamped on it, and he 30 even knows of rivalries (if such they were) as to who first issued money with this type; in Plutarch we get a name of the inventor of the Athenian ox-coin, and a 'historical' occasion or a motive for him, perfectly in keeping with the traditional 'archaeology' (in the ancient sense of the word denoting the 'prehistoric' history of Athens). This archaeology 35 clearly distinguishes two periods, the reign and achievements of Kekrops or his rival Erechtheus and the reign of Theseus, who assumes the role of a new Kekrops as founder and organizer of contemporary Athens, responsible not only for her constitution as a commonwealth but also for her various institutions<sup>20</sup>). The modern historian may well question the

truth and accuracy of this conception, and the numismatist is confronted with the question whether or not this account of the development of Athenian coinage is correct in the main point, *viz.* that there never was a foreign currency circulating in Athens, though Athenian coins were struck according to a foreign standard or system, as acknowledged by Aristotle. But he must not mix up the two view-points, *viz.* the tradition or the theory of the Atthidographers (Androtion?) and his own opinion on the development of Athenian coinage, based on the tradition (as understood by him), the finds of Athenian coins, and (last not least) on his general opinion on Greek (and oriental) coinage. Above all, he must allow for the limited knowledge that we may reasonably expect from our ancient informants and their general theories about Athenian history, and he must beware of endowing them with his own expert (and perhaps superior) knowledge of the real facts.

15 In works that deal with the present problem this obvious distinction is never clearly stated and rarely observed, and I therefore feel justified in enlarging on the second point. Seltman in his short but extremely lucid introductory chapter, headed by Plutarch's words on the ox-coins of Theseus, has dealt excellently with 'prehistoric days when cows and  
20 oxen were the units of barter', enumerating the extant examples of the ox-money or ox-unit (as distinguished from ox-coins), copper and iron ingots of an early date, 'cast in the shape of an ox-hide, dried and stretched' and representing 'the price of an ox', which have been found at Mykenai, off the coast of Euboia, and on Cretan and Egyptian monu-  
25 ments; and he concludes this chapter with the following words: 'it may be presumed that they were once in use in Attica as much as in the Argolid; thus these ox-hide copper bricks, the price of an ox, may be the concrete facts behind the later story that Theseus struck money and stamped an ox upon it'. But then there seems a certain, I may almost  
30 say, timidity, even a sort of contradiction arising apparently from a wrong valuation of the literary evidence<sup>21</sup>), when he concludes the discussion of the bull coin (which, for him, is an Athenian coin)<sup>22</sup>) with the words that though 'the Atthidographer's statement is clearly verified by fact, the type itself is no echo of prehistoric days when cows and oxen  
35 were the unit of barter. The bull device simply takes its place amid the many other heraldic devices of the Eupatrid money. Such is the plain but unromantic explanation of the bull as a type upon Athenian coinage'<sup>23</sup>). I do not propose to recommend a 'romantic' explanation, but a (perhaps) even more 'realistic' one which at the same time agrees better with our

literary evidence, numismatical and historical. Seltman while assuming a connexion between the ox-unit and the Theseus money, is rather vague about its nature. As far as I can make out, the 'concrete facts behind the later story' refer to the *a priori* statement that Theseus 'can be treated as a myth no longer', but 'like Arthur and Charlemagne was a power in his age', ruler 'over Argolis as well as Attica' <sup>24</sup>). Whether this supposition is right or wrong (and personally, I am fairly sure that it is very wide of the mark), it makes a topsy-turvy argument. There can be no reasonable doubt that the apparent connexion in our literary evidence is not between the ox-unit and Theseus (who cannot have been regarded as the inventor of Athenian coinage before the end of the 6th century, and was probably so regarded considerably later), but between the ox-unit (or the ox itself) and the ox-coins. Whatever clan it was that used the ox-type (if it was a clan, which is far from sure <sup>25</sup>) it may very well have known and even used the ox-unit, those copper ingots, till well into the 7th century; and when coining began in Athens not so very long (if at all) before Solon's archonship <sup>26</sup>), and the 'lumps of metal' in the shape of ox-hides were replaced by silver didrachms it is surely not a far-fetched assumption that the master of the mint struck coins with the type of a bull for a single clan or for the State. In any case, whether it was done by Theseus or a mint-master in the 7th or the 6th century, what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. The bull type on the coin (or, for the matter of that, the bull's head) was, perhaps, not an 'echo' of prehistoric times, but a much nearer thing; it may have been an entirely conscious action signifying that the piece of silver stood in a certain relation to the ox-hide ingot, that a certain number of them were the price of an ox <sup>27</sup>). The numismatists of the 4th century, referring to Homer and the laws of Drakon for 'some association between the ox-type and the coinage of Athens' (and not only of Athens), are obviously aware that there was such a relation of values between the coin and the beast stamped on it; to ascribe the same knowledge to the men who first struck coins in Athens, seems to me an obvious explanation at least of 'the tradition which hints at some connection between the earliest Athenian money and the type of an ox or a cow, a tradition too persistent to be ignored' <sup>28</sup>).

(201) Siebelis referred to Pollux 9, 28 μέρη δὲ πόλεως τὰ μὲν ἐκ θαλάττης αἰγιαλός, ἀκτὴ, ἡϊών, λιμὴν καὶ λιμένος στόμα καὶ βάθος καὶ μυχός, καὶ ὄρμος δὲ καὶ κρηπίς, νεώρια νεώσοικοι . . . . As ὄρμος means 'roadstead, anchorage, esp. the inner part of a harbour or basin where ships lie' <sup>1</sup>), κρηπίς would

mean the quay; cf. Herodt. 1, 185, 5 *ἐπέιτε δὲ οἱ ὀρώρυκτο* (*scil. ἡ λίμνη*), λίθους ἀγαγομένη κρηπίδα κύκλωι περὶ αὐτὴν ἤλασε; 2, 170, 2 *λίμνη τέ ἐστι ἐχομένη λιθίνηι κρηπίδι κεκοσμημένηι*. But τόπος Ἀθήνησιν makes it, perhaps, more likely that the quotation refers to the κρηπίς εὐμεγέθης near the Kantharos harbour where the periegetes Diodoros ὑπονοῶν μᾶλλον ἢ γινώσκων noted the tomb of Themistokles <sup>2</sup>). Even then F 201 and 203 may belong to the same context in the third book of the *Atthis* which must have recorded the building of the Peiraeus harbour and which contained also what Ph. had to say about Themistokles. The building of the harbour he most probably entered under the year 493/2 B.C., but we do not know in what connexion he narrated the vicissitudes of the later part of Themistokles' life and his death.

(202) The extraordinary snowfall may be assumed to be taken from Ph. There is nothing improbable in the idea that he noted down a prodigy like that even if it was not connected with a historical event, as was e.g. the first appearance of white pigeons in Greece when the Persian fleet suffered shipwreck near Mt. Athos in 492 B.C. <sup>1</sup>). The date can therefore not be determined more accurately than by ἐπὶ τῶν χρόνων Δαρείου which may come from a chronological handbook, and we must consider the whole of Dareios' reign, *viz.* 520/19-486/5 B.C. according to the chronographers. The decade 520/19-511/0 B.C. is quite without an archon's name with the exception of 511/0; in the decade 510/9-501/0 five or six names are lacking; 499/8-497/6 are blank again. There is no cogent reason to assign Lakrateides (let alone the Kebris of F 31) to the 'nineties, as Kirchner does <sup>2</sup>).

(203) The Scholia quote two authors because one of them describes the harbour and the other furnishes 'historical' facts connected in some way with the locality mentioned by the poet. That Ph. is said to have mentioned a village of the name of Κανθάρου λιμῆν and that he certainly mentioned its eponymous hero <sup>1</sup>) does not tell against the connexion of F 203 with F 201 <sup>2</sup>): notes like that, which the Atthidographer may have made in abundance, could easily be placed in the narrative by means of a brief subordinate clause. We cannot always tell whether such an eponymous hero really was a figure of cult, if only in his own village, or whether he was invented in order to explain the name of the place. In any case, the explanation is meant seriously, though Aristophanes may be playing with the dung-beetle and the Ναξιουργῆς κάνθαρος <sup>3</sup>). Some interpreter of Aristophanes took the joke seriously; but in that case the village, or the bay, must have been called κανθάρων λιμῆν, and the name must have been

extended to the whole harbour. Modern writers mostly explain the name by the peculiar shape of this part of the harbour <sup>4</sup>).

(204) Prasiai plays an important part *e.g.* in the connexion by cult between Attica and Delos <sup>2</sup>), but it must often have occurred in the 5 *Atthis*. The double citation does not prove that Ph. followed Thukydides (8, 95) in relating the surprise attack of the Peloponnesian fleet on the Peiraeus in 411 B.C. which the Athenians frustrated in time: αἱ δὲ τῶν Πελοποννησίων νῆες παραπλεύσασαι καὶ περιβαλοῦσαι Σούνιον ὀρμίζονταί μεταξύ Θορικοῦ τε καὶ Πρασιῶν κτλ. But it is possible that he did, and in 10 that case F 204 belongs to the fourth book.

(205—206) These fragments belong to the enumeration of the Cleisthenian demes, together with F 24-29, for Xypete was transferred to the Demetrias in 306/5 (307/6) B.C. Harpokr. s.v. *Ἐυπεταίονες*. . . . δῆμος τῆς Κεκροπίδος *Ἐυπέτη*, ἀφ' ἧς ὁ δημότης *Ἐυπεταίων*, ὡς Διόδωρος (372 F 23). 15 Hesych. s.v. *Ἐυπετέα*. δῆμος τῆς Κεκροπίδος φυλῆς. Hesych. s.v. *Σημαχίδαι* (*Σήμαχος* Phot. *Lex.* s.v.)· δῆμος τῆς 'Αντιοχίδος φυλῆς <sup>1</sup>). Euseb. *Chron. a. Abr.* 520 (Synkell. p. 297, 15) κατὰ 'Αμφικτύονα τὸν Δευκαλίωνος υἱὸν τινὲς φασὶ Διόνυσον εἰς τὴν 'Αττικὴν ἐλθόντα ξενωθῆναι *Σημάχῳ* καὶ τῇ θυγατρὶ αὐτοῦ νεβρίδα δωρῆσασθαι. The situation of the deme is determined by 20 *IG*<sup>2</sup> II 1582, 53 f. <sup>2</sup>) (ἡ ὁδὸς ἡ ἔξω τοῦ 'Ραγῶνος Λαβρίον φέρουσα καὶ τὸ *Σημάχειον*) as being in the region of Sunion, for we must not doubt that the Semacheion is in the deme Semachidai <sup>3</sup>). If this is correct 'Ἐπακρία can, of course, not mean the Cleisthenian trittys, which is the inland trittys of the Aigeis; it is more likely to be an untechnical designation of 25 a district because of its natural quality <sup>4</sup>). In the Semachidai Toepffer *A. G.* p. 292 finds 'without doubt an Attic clan'. Ph. certainly recorded the cult legend briefly, and possibly we may infer from its form as given by Eusebios <sup>5</sup>) the dress of the priestess. The legend, the resemblance of which to that of the Ikaria has often been observed <sup>6</sup>), was 30 possibly developed from that dress.

(207) The pusillanimity of a textual criticism which leaves unchanged the number 1̄θ̄ is particularly objectionable when it disregards a piece of bibliographic evidence <sup>1</sup>), replacing it by the improbable hypothesis that *Περὶ εὐρημάτων* was an appendix to the *Atthis*, the books of the two works 35 being numbered continuously. On the other hand, any alteration of the number is idle as long as nothing definitely indicates a certain book; Mueller's mechanical [̄]̄θ̄ is improbable as to the matter, while Boeckh's ἐν 'Ατθίδι is audacious, though perhaps not impossible. But we must at least put the question whether it is not rather the author's name which



is corrupt <sup>3</sup>): alongside of Melanippides Philoxenos might be suggested with some probability; his poetic works, though usually cited by individual titles, may have been numbered in an edition as tragedies were; at any rate Suda says s.v. Ἐγραψε διθυράμβους χδ<sup>3</sup>). The fact that Ph. is really cited further on, favours the conjecture, the more so because an anonymous quotation from a prose-writer follows that citation, and in collective quotations the ordinary sequence is poets and then prose-writers. The preceding note about the *Sphaira* may already have been taken from a prose-writer; it might even derive from Ph., who in Περὶ μαντικῆς dealt with Orpheus <sup>4</sup>) and gave his opinion as to the authenticity of works ascribed to other writers, too <sup>5</sup>). But the citation from him is too distinctly limited, and its contents seem to suggest with some probability Περὶ εὐρημάτων which contained a considerable number of mythical facts <sup>6</sup>). The invention consists in the χορδαί, strings of gut presumably for the lyre which replaced flaxen threads, and it is recorded thus by Herakleides of Pontos <sup>7</sup>) whereas one of the heurematographic sources of Pliny makes Linos the inventor of the lyre itself <sup>8</sup>). With the version of Ph., according to whom this innovation rouses the wrath of Apollo, the reasons adduced in Schol. A agree: ἦτοι τὸ λίνον ἦιδεν ὁ ἐξῆπτο ἀντὶ τῆς νευρᾶς τῆς κιθάρας, ἐπεὶ οἱ πρῶτοι τοῖς θεοῖς μετὰ ᾠδῆς ὑποκιθαρίζοντες οὐκ ἐξ ἐντέρων κατεσκευάζοντο τὰς κιθάρας, οὐχ ὄσιον οὐδὲ θεοῖς ἀρεστόν εἶναι ὑπολαμβάνοντες [διὰ] τὸ ἐκ νευρῶν πεποιῆσθαι ἀλλ' ἐκ λίνου πεποιημένου <sup>9</sup>). All these stories are founded on the interpretation of the verse of Homer for which the mythical figure of Linos <sup>10</sup>) was of no importance, and they are hardly earlier than the exegesis of Homer and the history of music of the fourth century. But when Ph. (it is uncertain whether he was the first <sup>11</sup>)) connected the death of the personified Linos with his innovation he made a compromise with the Theban version as reported by Pausan. 9, 29, 5 ff.: in the sanctuary of the Muses on Helikon τὴν εὐθείαν ἐρχομένῳ πρὸς τὸ ἄλσος ἐστὶν εἰκὼν Εὐφῆμης ἐπειρασμένη λίθῳ (τροφὸν δὲ εἶναι τὴν Εὐφῆμην λέγουσι τῶν Μουσῶν), and μετ' αὐτὴν Λίνος ἐστὶν ἐν πέτρῳ μικρᾷ σπηλαίου τρόπον εἰργασμένη. τοῦτωι κατὰ ἔτος ἕκαστον πρὸ τῆς θυσίας τῶν Μουσῶν ἐναγίζουσι. λέγεται δὲ ὡς ὁ Λίνος οὗτος παῖς μὲν Οὐρανίας εἶη καὶ Ἀμφιμάρου τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος, μεγίστην δὲ τῶν τε ἐφ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ὄσοι πρότερον ἐγένοντο λάβοι δόξαν ἐπὶ μουσικῇ, καὶ ὡς Ἀπόλλων ἀποκτείνειεν αὐτὸν ἐξισούμενον κατὰ τὴν ᾠδὴν. We do not know how fully Ph. treated Linos, but we must assume that he knew this or a similar version. It contains the motif of ἐξισοῦσθαι τοῖς θεοῖς which is wide-spread and not always late <sup>12</sup>); nor

does Pausanias' narrative create the impression of being a recent invention. It is remarkable that according to it Linos is not the son of Apollo (as he is in the general and in the Argive tradition which is at present considered to be the original<sup>13</sup>), but descended from Poseidon; 5 further that in the cult on Helicon, by the 'heroic' previous sacrifice, he appears in close connexion with the Muses<sup>14</sup>) who did not originally belong to the sphere of Apollo either. Hesiod still knows the Muses alone on Helikon, not Apollo, and only preconceived opinion, which suggests again and again a close relation between Hesiod and Delphi, is capable of 10 treating that fact as a matter of no importance. Also the tomb of Linos in Thebes<sup>15</sup>) is at least earlier than the battle of Chaironeia<sup>16</sup>). It also looks like sound tradition that Pausanias' Thebans (who in this case no doubt represent literary *Θηβαικά*) honestly admit *τὰ ἐπιθήματα τοῦ τάφου καὶ ὅσα σημεῖα ἄλλα ἦν ἀνὰ χρόνον ἀφανισθῆναι*, a statement which may be 15 valid already for the fourth century. Further they do not assign to Linos any particular invention, simply regarding him as an extremely famous early musician. Pausanias himself also (unless the passage derives from the same source) shows an exceptionally sound judgement: *ἔπη δὲ οὔτε ὁ Ἀμφιμάρου Λίνος οὔτε ὁ τούτου γινόμενος ὕστερον* (the teacher of Herakles) *ἔποίησαν, ἧ καὶ ποιηθέντα ἔς τοὺς ἔπειτα οὐκ ἤλθεν*. It does not appear impossible that the legend of Linos contains the genuine memory of some 'hero' from whom the Delphic god took the cithara as he took the lyre from Hermes in the Homeric hymn; he merely treated his brother more amiably than the foreign rival<sup>17</sup>). The Theban legend is at any rate 20 early and concerned entirely with Linos who is a well-defined figure in it. In the further development this 'son of the Muse'<sup>18</sup>) was made the son of Apollo, and this genealogy naturally carried the day. It is particularly regrettable that we do not know by whom *Οὐρανίη ἔτικτε Λίνον πολυήρατον υἷόν* in *Hesiodus personatus*.

30 (208) About Musaios<sup>1</sup>) an abundant literary tradition was at the disposal of Ph.: *εἰρήκασι δὲ περὶ αὐτοῦ ἄλλοι τε καὶ Γλαῦκος*<sup>2</sup>) Harpokr. s.v. *Μουσαῖος*; Herodotos of Herakleia had written *Ὀρφέως καὶ Μουσαίου ἱστορίαν*<sup>3</sup>), and Aristoxenos *ἐν τοῖς Πραξίδαμαντείοις* (Harpokr. l.c.) also seems to have dealt with him in detail. All these sources cannot have provided 35 Ph. with many facts, for, in comparison with Orpheus or Eumolpos or even with Linos (F 207), Musaios is a rather indefinite figure. Following Aristoxenos we had best divide both the genealogies and the information about his life into two groups: *ὅτι οἱ μὲν ἐκ Θράκιᾶς εἰρήκασι τὸν ἄνδρα εἶναι, οἱ δὲ αὐτόχθονα ἐξ Ἐλευσίνος*. There is one piece of evidence

only that cannot be fitted into this grouping, viz. Μουσαῖος Θηβαῖος, Θαμύρα υἱός, τοῦ Φιλάμμωνος, μελοποιός in the Suda. As yet nobody has explained it, nor can I, for Musaios is definitely an epic poet: as an ἔπικοιός he was quoted in the sources of the Suda concerned with history of literature, and as such he was known to as early a writer as Demokritos, who called him the inventor of the hexameter <sup>4)</sup>; all works assigned to him are of epic type <sup>5)</sup>. In any case, neither the statement that Musaios was a Theban nor the section in Strabo's digression about the Kuretes <sup>6)</sup> justifies the assertion of Toepffer *Att. Gen.* p. 38 that Musaios 'was localized at any place where the cult of the Muses was established' and that 'not until he became the father of Eumolpos was he made an Eleusinian autochthon'. Although the tradition about the Thracian Musaios, poorly attested hitherto <sup>7)</sup>, has recently proved to be early by a Meidias vase of about 400 B.C. <sup>8)</sup> there can be no doubt, in my opinion, that he was originally domiciled in Attica <sup>9)</sup>, or, as we had perhaps better state at once, that he was invented there as the author of a poem in the time of the Peisistratids, the Theogony, or, more likely, the *Χρησμοί*, which I take to be the earliest work ascribed to this apocryphal figure <sup>10)</sup>, and that he became a Thracian not until he was connected with Orpheus or/and Eumolpos <sup>11)</sup>. In that poem he may have spoken of himself as 'son of Selene' <sup>12)</sup>, and he is preferably called thus, no name of a father being given: σὺ δ' ἄκουε, φαεσφόρου ἔκγονε Μήνης, Μουσαῖε the Orphic *Διαθήκαι* (F 245/7 Kern) address him; Μουσαίου καὶ Ὀρφείως, Σελήνης τε καὶ Μουσαῶν ἔκγονων says Plato *Rep.* p. 364 E; υἱὸς Μήνης . . . Μουσαῖος Hermesianax (Athen. 13, 71 p. 597 CD) *Leontion* v. 15/6; *nam eum alii Lunae filium, alii Orphei volunt* Serv. Verg. A. 6, 667 <sup>13)</sup>. When later he was introduced into the Eleusinian sphere he either lost his mother <sup>14)</sup> or became the son of Deiope, and he acquired a father. The sequence of ancestors in the Suda distinctly points to Eleusis: υἱὸς Ἀντιφήμου τοῦ Εὐδύφημου τοῦ Ἐκφάντου τοῦ Κερκυῶνος <sup>15)</sup>, δὲν κατεπολέμησεν ὁ Θησεύς, καὶ Σελήνης (Schol. Aristoph. *Ran.* 1033; Ἐλένης Ἐλήνης Sud) γυναικός. We do not know its author, but it was combined with the connexion between Eumolpos and Musaios by Andron who most probably belongs to the fourth century <sup>16)</sup>. In this connexion Musaios is mostly—and the earliest witnesses always so make him—the father of Eumolpos: thus the Meidias vase; the Marmor Parium A 15 according to a certain supplement; Andron 10 F 13; the inventor of the ὑποθήκαι Εὐμόλπωι τῶι υἱῶι, ἔπη δ̄ <sup>17)</sup>; evidently also Plato *Rep.* p. 393 D Μουσαῖος καὶ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ; and all passages where Eumolpos is called son of Deiope <sup>18)</sup>. Ph. has reversed the sequence and presumably was the first to do

so<sup>19</sup>), for in accord with him are only the funeral inscription at Phaleron Diog. Laert. I, 3 Εὐμόλπου φίλον υἷόν ἔχει τὸ Φαληρικὸν οὐδας / Μουσαίου φθιμένου σώμ' ὑπὸ τῷδε τάφῳ and Euseb. Chron. a. Abr. 752 *Orfeus Thrax clarus habetur, cuius discipulus fuit Musaeus, filius Eumolphi*. I should think 5 that Ph. acted as he did on account of the pedigrees of the Eleusinian clans, which for him were historical: Eumolpos as the ancestor of the Eumolpidai could not be eliminated, and the clan hardly acknowledged a pedigree starting with a human father<sup>20</sup>). When Ph. kept the mother Selene, in contradiction to the general tradition which works with 10 Deiope, but in this instance in accord with the evidence of the poet himself<sup>21</sup>), he may have had the same reason for doing so, for thus he moved Eumolpos up into primeval times. We do, however, not know whether Ph. recognized more than one bearer of the name<sup>22</sup>), and we cannot tell whether he dated him precisely since we do not know from 15 which work F 208 is taken<sup>23</sup>), nor do we know in what context he mentioned Musaios. It is quite uncertain whether we may attribute to Ph. anything beyond the genealogy which has definitely been handed down under his name. What the scholion reports about the activities of Musaios cannot have been derived from Aristophanes<sup>24</sup>), for according 20 to him the τελεταί belong to the domain of Orpheus while Musaios invents ἐξακέσεις νόσων and χρησμοί; but these statements precisely agree with what the ἀγύρται καὶ μάντιες claim to be able to achieve in Plato *Rep.* p. 364 E. <sup>25</sup>). That is remarkable because it makes the epic poet Musaios<sup>26</sup>) a *kathartes*, adding the χρησμολόγος as a variant only (sup- 25 posing it was added by the same Scholiast). The Scholiast cites for the latter function only Sophokles, but actually it is so abundantly attested<sup>27</sup>) that one must regard it as a speciality of Musaios: the existence of an early collection of oracles, from which we derived the statement that Selene was Musaios' mother and the evidence for his origin from Athens, 30 furnishes a sufficient explanation. There is no cogent reason for doubting that the description belongs to Ph., and if it does Περὶ μαντικῆς might be considered as the source of F 208; but we cannot prove it.

(209—211) I do not see how it can be determined with any degree of probability in which of his works Ph. gave a βίος of Homer, as we may 35 call it<sup>1</sup>), for the dating ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἀθήνησιν Ἀρχίππου does not with certainty prove a digression in the *Atthis*. It might be possible that he gave the well known group of the four earliest poets<sup>1</sup>) in Περὶ μαντικῆς where he dealt with Orpheus (F 76/7) and perhaps also with Musaios (F 208), before he discussed them individually either as μάντιες or as

witnesses for early divination. But perhaps one of Ph.'s books on men of letters is more likely; we hardly know all of them <sup>2</sup>). Aristarchos gave Homer's date ἐν τοῖς Ἀρχιλοχείοις ὑπομνήμασιν <sup>3</sup>); but there the synchronism between Homer and Archilochos, proposed by Theopompos 115 F 205, furnished a particular reason for dealing with the question. All things considered, I should like to assign not only F 209-211, but also F 212-214 (216) to the Ὀλυμπιάδες if they really were a chronological-historical sketch which Ph. created for that part of his research work which extended beyond Athens <sup>4</sup>). Anyone preferring the *Atthis* will contend that everything said in F 209-211 could easily be gathered from two brief annalistic entries, for in view of the juxtaposition with Xenophanes in F 210 (whose opinion was simply derived from the sequence "Ὀμηρος θ' Ἡσιόδός τε and from the line ἐξ ἀρχῆς καθ' Ὀμηρον ἐπεὶ μεμαθήκασι πάντες) we cannot assert that Ph. discussed fully, or at all, the reasons for his sequence Homer-Hesiod <sup>5</sup>), and the same argument may be valid for Homer's native place. In any case, the statements of Ph. about Homer, as far as they are known to us, are confined to these two points, though F 212 deals also with the Ὀμηρίδαι, and we cannot prove that Ph. went into the particulars of Homer's life as he did in regard to Euripides in the special books about this poet (F 217/21).

(209) Argos as the native place of Homer occurs in the epigrams of the Seven Towns *Anth. Pal.* 16, 297-298 <sup>1</sup>) and of the *Lives* anonymously (τινέες, ἄλλοι) in Ps. Plutarch. II p. 25, 8; Scorial. II p. 29, 10 Wil. The mother Hymetho also points to Argos <sup>2</sup>): Vit. Scorial. I p. 28, 10; *Cer-tamen* § 3 p. 35, 18 Wil. <sup>3</sup>), to whom the preceding series of fathers adds the shadowy Δαήμων ἔμπορος <sup>4</sup>). The authority mentioned is Δημόκριτος Τροιζήνιος, whom Wilamowitz (in Diels *Poet. Philos.* p. 224) altered with a fair degree of probability to Δημήτριος Τροιζήνιος, author of a book Κατὰ σοφιστῶν. He belongs at the earliest to the time of Didymos; therefore it remains an open question whether the particulars reach as far back as the Argive home: it sometimes happens in these biographies that a demonstrably earlier opinion is cited from a later grammarian, perhaps because he developed it more fully or gave new reasons for it. Argos (and Pylos) are forgotten or have dropped out in Hesychios' enumeration of twenty places claiming to be the home of Homer <sup>5</sup>). It is, of course, merely one of the numerous conjectures, proposed partly as early as the (fifth and) fourth centuries, though it may be said to be founded a little better than most claims of towns of Greece proper. There can be no serious doubt <sup>6</sup>) that it rests upon the prominent part Argos plays in the Homeric

Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.)

poems and upon the honours which that town conferred on the poet because of that prominence: Herodt. 5, 67, 1 Κλεισθένης γὰρ Ἀργείοισι πολεμήσας τοῦτο μὲν ῥαψωιδούς ἔπαυσε ἐν Σικυῶνι ἀγωνίζεσθαι τῶν Ὀμηρείων ἐπέων εἵνεκα, ὅτι Ἀργεῖοί τε καὶ Ἄργος τὰ πολλὰ πάντα ὑμνεῖται; *Cer-  
5 iamem* 17-18 τιμηθεὶς δὲ μεγάλως (*scil.* Ὀμηρος) παραγίνεται εἰς Ἄργος, καὶ λέγει ἐκ τῆς Ἰλιάδος τὰ ἔπη τάδε (B 560/8) ὅτι . . . τῶν δ' Ἀργείων οἱ προ-  
εστηκότες ὑπερβολῆι χαρέντες ἐπὶ τῷ ἐγκωμιάζεσθαι τὸ γένος αὐτῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ  
ἐνδοξοτάτου τῶν ποιητῶν αὐτὸν μὲν πολυτελεῖσι δωρεαῖς ἐτίμησαν, εἰκό-  
να δὲ χαλκῆν ἀναστήσαντες ἐψηφίσαντο θυσίαν ἐπιτελεῖν Ὀμήρωι καθ'  
10 ἡμέραν καὶ κατὰ μῆνα καὶ κατ' ἐνιαυτόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ θυσίαν πενταετηρίδα ἐς  
Χίον ἀποστέλλειν· ἐπιγράφουσι δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς εἰκόνης αὐτοῦ «Θεῖος Ὀμηρος ὅδ'  
ἐστίν, ὃς Ἑλλάδα τὴν μεγάλην / πᾶσαν ἐνόσμησεν καλλιπεῖ σοφίηι, /  
ἔξοχα δ' Ἀργείους κτλ.»<sup>8</sup>). Perhaps Welcker *Der epische Cyklus* I p. 191  
was justified in calling to mind the Argive school of epic poets invented by  
15 Demetrios of Phaleron (228 F 32), the head of which was one Perimedes  
of Argos<sup>9</sup>); one may add that an Argive local historian (Dionysios 308  
F 2) ascribed the invention of rhapsody to Argos. The name of Homer is  
not mentioned here, but this evidence shows of what we may believe  
fourth century history of literature to have been capable; it is entirely  
20 in the style of this philology that it takes a further step by making  
the astounding conjecture that Homer himself had been an Argive,  
though we seldom can tell for certain how far these scholars were serious.  
In this case Ph. has taken seriously the suggestion, proposed perhaps by  
Herakleides of Pontos<sup>10</sup>), and he (therefore?) refrained from setting up  
25 an Athenian counter-claim, which would have been easy enough<sup>11</sup>).

(210) Here I think we can ascertain the source of Ph. with a fair amount  
of certainty. Even if Gellius' authority could have gathered the chronol-  
ogical relation of the two poets from their sequence in the *Atthis* (which is  
doubtful), Ph. must have had reasons for discarding the conception of  
30 their being contemporaries which was prevalent down to the third  
century<sup>1</sup>). I think it is probable that Herakleides of Pontos convinced  
him, who wrote two books *Περὶ τῆς Ὀμήρου καὶ Ἡσιόδου ἡλικίας*<sup>2</sup>), in  
which he tried to prove that Homer was the earlier of the two<sup>3</sup>). This  
opinion must have been new at the time, for Chamaileon claimed pri-  
35 ority<sup>4</sup>); it became dominant among the Alexandrian scholars of note.

(211) Clement and Tatian excerpt from the same source<sup>1</sup>), the latter  
more accurately as an exception, for he preserved the only date which is  
certainly from Ph., *viz.* ἐπὶ ἀρχοντος Ἀθήνησι Ἀρχιππου. Tatian arranges  
the various dates according to the chronological distance of the poet from

the year of the Trojan War as given by Eratosthenes-Apollodoros, from the not quite eighty years of Krates (what he actually said was *πρὸ τῆς Ἡρακλειδῶν καθόδου*) down to the 180 years of Apollodoros who actually said *μετὰ ἕτη ἑκατὸν τῆς Ἴωνικῆς ἀποικίας Ἀγεσιλάου τοῦ Δορυσσ[αί]ου Λακεδαιμονίων βασιλεύοντος*. The controversy (and the problem of Krates is the same in principle) was mainly concerned with the question whether Homer lived before the Ionic Migration (Eratosthenes), at the time of it (Aristarchos), or after (Apollodoros <sup>2</sup>); consequently the '180 years after the Trojan War' certainly are an addition of the compiler <sup>3</sup>). The latter <sup>10</sup> could gather Ph.'s attitude from the date *ἐπὶ Ἀρχίππου* <sup>4</sup>), even if Ph. did not expressly add *μετὰ τὴν Ἴωνικὴν ἀποικίαν*. Whether he did we cannot tell, as we do not know his reasons for this date <sup>5</sup>); perhaps he simply took it over from Herakleides. Anyhow there is no use in guessing <sup>6</sup>). But if his Athenian king list was the same as Kastor's (and we have no reason <sup>15</sup> to doubt that as far as *βασιλεῖς* and *ἄρχοντες διὰ βίου* are concerned <sup>7</sup>)) he certainly assumed that Homer was later than the Ionic Migration, for the *Atthis* of the Marmor Parium places this event under Medon <sup>8</sup>) (the second king before Archippos), Archemachos and Kastor under Akastos (the immediate predecessor of Archippos), no historian under Archippos <sup>20</sup> himself. That late date would be out of the question for an Attic list, and to ascribe it to Ph. <sup>9</sup>), that cautious chronographer, would be doubly impossible: for the synchronism of the Ionic Migration with Homer is typical for the opinion which took Homer to be an Athenian <sup>10</sup>), and Ph. did not share that view. We must content ourselves with these statements, <sup>25</sup> though we may add that Ph. is much nearer to the views of Herodotos and Thukydidēs, who date Homer 'long after the Τρωϊκά', than to the early genealogists and historians of literature who made him a contemporary of the war.

(212) The two competing explanations from *ῥάπτειν* and *ῥάβδος* obviously are pure etymologies as to their origin, and are meant quite generally: they imply neither a theory about the textual history of Homer <sup>1</sup>) nor a definite local reference <sup>2</sup>). Both were brought forward in the fifth century at the latest (a fact that should not appear surprising) and were known already to Pindar <sup>3</sup>). The explanation accepted <sup>35</sup> by Kallimachos and the Lexicographers <sup>4</sup>) derives the designation from the typical attribute of the reciting poet who holds the staff in his hand <sup>5</sup>) and who has ceased to accompany his recital with a musical instrument; that accepted by Ph. explains it from the action of the poet which consists in the *συντίθεσθαι* of the *ἔπη* without their being set to music as they

are in ἀλωιδία and κιθαρωιδία<sup>6</sup>). The former explanation contains an insuperable linguistic difficulty, the latter is approved by modern etymologists as it stands<sup>7</sup>). 'Ραψωιδός is neither a 'nickname'<sup>8</sup>) nor has it an 'appreciative tinge'<sup>9</sup>); ῥάπτειν ἀοιδὴν is a simple metaphor taken from the language of handicraft and manual technique. Graphic metaphors like this are frequently used in speaking of the business of the poet, and this one is particularly well suited in the case of the epic poet who composes by stringing together his hexameters like beads. Whether it was Ph. who gave the evidence of the Ps. Hesiodic verses<sup>10</sup>) is not certain, but it appears probable; at any rate the citation does not come from Nikokles<sup>11</sup>). Ph. could make use of the lines even if he believed Homer to be earlier than Hesiod<sup>12</sup>); for what he was concerned with was not the chronological relation of the two poets but the meaning of the word ῥαψωιδός, which was as obvious ἐν νεαροῖς ὕμνοις ῥάψαντες ἀοιδὴν as in the ῥαπτῶν ἐπέων ἀοιδοί of Pindar. He was justified in not taking exception to ἀοιδή, for ἀεῖδειν had for a long time not been confined to singing and musical texts<sup>13</sup>). I shall not altogether deny the remote possibility that the explanation occurred in the *Atthis* 'ubi de Pisistrato eiusque filiis exposuit'<sup>14</sup>), but we must not on the strength of it make Ph. a witness for the so-called Peisistratean recension.

(213) Tzetz. Schol. Hes. *Op̄p.* p. 7, 33 Gaisford Ἀριστοτέλης γὰρ ὁ φιλόσοφος (μᾶλλον δ' οἶμαι ὁ τοὺς Πέπλους συντάξας) ἐν τῇ Ὅρχομενίων πολιτεία (F 565 Rose) Στησίχορον τὸν μελοποιὸν εἶναι φησιν υἱὸν Ἡσιόδου ἐκ τῆς Κτιμένης (Westermann κτη- V) αὐτῶι γεννηθέντα τῆς Ἀμφιφάνους καὶ Γανύκτορος ἀδελφῆς, θυγατρὸς δὲ Φηγέως (ν φυγέως V) · ὁ δὲ Στησίχορος οὗτος σύγχρονος ἦν Πυθαγόρῃ . . . καὶ Φαλάριδι. Suda s.v. Στησίχορος · Εὐφόρβου ἢ Εὐφῆμου, ὡς δὲ ἄλλοι Εὐκλείδου ἢ †Υέτους (Εὐέτου Wil καὶ [name of the mother]?) ἢ Ἡσιόδου. Cicero *De rep.* 2, 20 (= Apollodoros 244 F 337) [*neque enim Stesichorus nepos eius*] (scil. *Hesiodi*), *ut diximus quidam [e]x filia. quo [enim] ille mortuus, e]odem [est an]no na[tus Si]monides, o]lympia[de sexta et quin]qua[gesima* (556/5 B.C.).

The fabulous accounts about a son of Hesiod were developed from *Op̄p.* 270 f. νῦν δὲ ἐγὼ μῆτ' αὐτὸς ἐν ἀνθρώποισι δίκαιος / εἶην μῆτ' ἐμὸς υἱός, and some writer (Alkidamas?) connected them with the legend of Hesiod's death in Lokris and his tomb at Orchomenos<sup>1</sup>). That the mother (who in *Certamen* 14 is anonymous) is called Klymene by Ph.-Proklos, Ktimene by Aristotle-Tzetzes is important only for the question whether Ph. followed Aristotle. Although the difference is slight<sup>2</sup>) we had better answer the question in the negative, for Klymene is also the



name of Homer's mother in the legend of Ios<sup>3</sup>), whereas the brother of the girl whom Hesiod seduced is called Ktimenos by Eratosthenes<sup>4</sup>). The latter story was told by several writers of the fourth century B.C., and the literature concerning both Hesiod and Stesichoros (the latter particularly appeared in the history of music) was abundant already in the time of Ph. Again Herakleides of Pontos (Plutarch. *De mus.* 3) was among those who treated Stesichoros, and as he even determined the dates of the inventors of the various species of music on the basis of the ἀναγραφὴ ἢ ἐν Σικυῶνι ἀποκειμένη (which dated by the priestesses of Hera), one would think that he gave a date for 'Stesichoros and the ἀρχαῖοι μελοποιοί' as well, and that it was a fairly early one. It is only natural that the genealogical connexion constructed between the two poets (in which of course Stesichoros was assigned to an earlier time than that usually assumed, not Hesiod to a later) roused objections from the professional chronographers. Even when the latest dates for Hesiod were assumed<sup>5</sup>) (736/3 B.C. Tzetz. *Chil.* 12, 196; 13, 648; 'after ol. 14 (15) = 724 (720) B.C. Schol. *Il.* Ψ 683), and the earliest for Stesichoros<sup>6</sup>) (birth or floruit ol. 37 = 632/29 B.C. in the Suda) the interval was too great for the relation between father and son. Some writer tried to overcome the difficulty by making Stesichoros the grandson of Hesiod, but Apollodoros rejected the combination altogether<sup>7</sup>). Accordingly we cannot solve the problem by assuming a third and earliest Stesichoros, an ancestor of the famous lyric poet, the first and real Stesichoros<sup>8</sup>); we must assume that we are dealing here with one of the many pre-Hellenistic dates which, though meant quite seriously at the time, could not be kept by scientific chronology working as far as possible with documents. We seldom can tell what considerations moved those earlier authors. But it seems likely that the genealogical connexion, by using the legend, merely expresses in a more primitive manner the characterization by later historians of literature: *Stesichorum epici carminis onera lyra sustinentem*<sup>9</sup>). As to the provenience of F 213, what is said on F 209-211 holds good. Here, however, the *Althis* seems fairly out of the question; one of the works on history of literature is more likely<sup>10</sup>). The question must remain open whether Mnaseas represents the corruption of another symbolic name, or whether it is the well-known author who was quoted for a variant<sup>11</sup>).

(214) Clem. Al. *Strom.* I, 132, 3 'Ἰππῶ τε ἢ Χείρωνος καὶ Βοιωῶ καὶ Μαντῶ καὶ τῶν Σιβυλλῶν τὸ πλῆθος (scil. παρ' Ἑλλήσι χρησμολόγοι γεγονέναι φέρονται). Suda s.v. Παλαίφατος· Ἀθήνησιν ἐποποιός, υἱὸς Ἀκταίου καὶ Βοιοῦς, οἱ δὲ Ἰοκλέους (Οἰκλέους Ddf) φασὶ καὶ Μετανείρας· οἱ δὲ Ἐρμοῦ. γέγονε δὲ

κατὰ μὲν τινὰς μετὰ Φημονόην, κατὰ δὲ ἄλλους καὶ πρὸ αὐτῆς. Pausan. 10, 5, 7  
 μεγίστη δὲ καὶ παρὰ πλείστων ἐς Φημονόην δόξα ἐστίν, ὡς πρόμαντις γένοιτο ἡ  
 Φημονόη τοῦ θεοῦ πρώτη, καὶ πρώτη τὸ ἐξάμετρον ἤισεν. Βοιωὶ δὲ ἐπιχωρία  
 γυνὴ ποιήσασα ὕμνον Δελφοῖς ἔφη κατασκευάσασθαι τὸ μαντεῖον τῷ θεῷ  
 5 τοὺς ἀφικομένους ἐξ Ὑπερβορέων τοὺς τε ἄλλους καὶ Ὀλλῆνα· τοῦτον δὲ καὶ  
 μαντεύσασθαι πρῶτον καὶ αἶσαι πρῶτον τὸ ἐξάμετρον.

Boio is a shadowy figure. The soundest evidence we have is Clement's  
 counting her among the χρησμολόγοι and grouping her with Manto and  
 Hippo, unfortunately without any particulars about her native place or  
 10 her descent <sup>1</sup>). It is doubtful whether Pausanias' Delphic γυνὴ ἐπιχωρία  
 was a χρησμολόγος, for although she reported the institution of the oracle  
 she did this not in a mantic poem but in an (apocryphal) hymn; nor ap-  
 parently was the Athenian woman, who is not called a poetess but merely  
 appears as the mother of a very early poet, among the numerous subjects  
 15 of whom not one concerning divination is found. The traditions do not  
 seem to be old, and they certainly are not independent of each other;  
 what unites them is the opposition to the official Delphic theology and to  
 claims on the part of Delphi <sup>2</sup>). Alongside of Boio there exists a male  
 Boios who is the author of an *Ornithogonia*, and the fact must be empha-  
 20 sized that the author of that poem in two books is always cited as Βοῖος,  
 never as Βοιωὶ <sup>3</sup>). The time of the poem cannot be determined, but it is  
 more likely to belong to late than to early Hellenism <sup>4</sup>). If the Βοιωὶ χρησ-  
 μολόγος is an early figure (and Clement makes this appear probable) the  
 name of the author may well be invented from that of Boio <sup>5</sup>), particularly  
 25 because Phemonoe competes as the authoress of a similar poem <sup>6</sup>). One  
 might infer that Boio belongs to the sphere of Ornithomania, that she  
 was regarded as the authoress of an Ὀρνιθομαντεία. True, the passage from  
 Athenaios seems to be evidence for attributing to Boio an *Ornithogonia*,  
 but the words ἡ Βοιωὶ, ὡς φησι Φιλόχορος are distinctly an addition, made  
 30 probably by Athenaios himself <sup>7</sup>), from which we learn with full certainty  
 only that the female name Boio occurred in Ph. In view of Clement's  
 χρησμολόγος one might ask whether he knew her as the authoress of an  
*Ornithomanteia*. That is not the same as an *Ornithogonia* even if the latter,  
 either throughout or occasionally, mentions the prophetic role played by  
 35 the transformed birds <sup>8</sup>). The *Ornithogonia* is a species of Metamorphoseis  
 which are proper to Hellenistic poetry, whereas divination from birds  
 is an early type, and a poem of that kind occurred in some Mss. of  
 Hesiod's *Erga* <sup>9</sup>). It would be conceivable, although it can of course not  
 be proved, that Ph. took Boio for the authoress of that poem, and that

the late author of the *Ornithogonia* took his name from it. But it is equally possible that Ph. knew another poem under the name of Boio, the 'Hesiodean' presumably not being the only one of its kind <sup>10</sup>). In any case, the mistake of Athenaios would be easily explainable: he may have  
 5 confused the *Ornithomanteia* of Boio with the *Ornithogonia* of Boios. All these conjectures are more or less uncertain, we cannot even assign F 214 to Περὶ μαντικῆς with any confidence <sup>11</sup>).

(215/6) Strabo's source is Apollodoros (\*244 F 334), that of Athenaios cannot be stated with certainty. The fact that Ph. took for an Athenian  
 10 from Aphidna <sup>1</sup>) the poet who was active in Sparta at some time in the seventh century does not justify the reproach of excessive local patriotism; he merely accepts an opinion dominant in fourth century Athens and supported by authors of all kinds—the philosopher Plato, the orator Lykurgos, the historians Kallisthenes and Ephoros <sup>2</sup>), and presumably  
 15 the writers of history of music and literature as well <sup>3</sup>). We may assume that Ph. did not even put to himself the question of when and how that opinion had arisen <sup>4</sup>); for him it simply was *the* tradition, which he had the less reason to doubt as the history of music offered many other examples of poets for whom Sparta had sent from abroad <sup>5</sup>). It is likely that he  
 20 treated the matter comprehensively in Περὶ Ἀλκμᾶνος. The *Atthis* <sup>6</sup>) is less probable, for it hardly had any reason to mention the so-called second Messenian war which was an exclusively Peloponnesian war of coalition. But if it was the *Atthis* we should have to suggest a digression on the occasion either of the so-called third Messenian war, or rather of the  
 25 restoration of Messene by Epameinondas: in both cases Sparta appealed to Athens for help. The account in F 216 is not decisive: if the custom did exist it can actually not have been older than the fourth century <sup>7</sup>), but it is by no means certain that Ph. knew that. The parallel tradition merely shows how scanty was general information about contemporary  
 30 Sparta notwithstanding the numerous Πολιτεῖαι Λακεδαιμονίων written in the fourth century. The passages agree only in the fact that in times of war Sparta used the poems of Tyrtaios, but about the particulars they reported differently from Ph.: (1) Lykurgos *In Leocrat.* 106 f. κατέλιπε γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐλεγεία ποιήσας, ὧν ἀκούοντες παιδεύονται πρὸς ἀνδρείαν· καὶ περὶ μὲν  
 35 τοὺς ἄλλους ποιητὰς οὐδένα λόγον ἔχοντες (*scil.* οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι), περὶ τοῦτον οὕτω σφόδρα ἐσπουδάκασι, ὥστε νόμον ἔθεντο, ὅταν ἐν τοῖς ὅπλοις ἐξεστρατευμένοι ᾖσι, καλεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως σκηπὴν ἀκουσομένους τῶν Τυρταίου ποιημάτων ἅπαντας κτλ. (2) The anonymous author <sup>8</sup>) whom Athenaios 14, 29 p. 630 F quotes immediately before Ph.: καὶ αὐτοὶ δ' οἱ

Λάκωνες ἐν τοῖς πολέμοις τὰ Τυρταίου ποιήματα ἀπομνημονεύοντες ἔρρυθμον κίνησιν ποιῶνται. The Athenian in Plato *Legg.* p. 629 B quite vaguely assumes that the Spartan is διακορῆς αὐτῶν (*scil.* τῶν ποιημάτων τῶν τοῦ Τυρταίου <sup>9</sup>)).

- 5 (217—221) F 217 and F 221 may belong to one of the two works in which were discussed factual and textual questions mainly (or so it seems) from the tragedies of Euripides, *viz.* Περὶ τραγωιδιῶν σύγγραμμα and Πρὸς Ἀσκληπιάδην ἐπιστολή. The subject of the book Περὶ Εὐριπίδου, from which no quotations are preserved, is doubtful, but we may assign to it the biographical statements F 218-220; perhaps it simply was a detailed biography of the poet. It is certainly not accidental that the fragments do not supply anything of the kind for Aischylos and Sophokles although Ph. wrote as many as five books about the μῦθοι of the plays of the latter. It does, however, not seem likely that he intended to fill a gap with the 15 biography of Euripides, for Herakleides of Pontos (and there may have been others) wrote Περὶ τῶν τριῶν τραγωιδιοποιῶν. The special book of Ph. may more likely be explained by the fact that already for the fourth century Euripides was *the* tragic poet. People were interested in the circumstances of his life partly because they had been distorted by the 20 comic poets; moreover, numerous allusions to contemporary facts and persons seemed to be contained in his plays, and their interpretation was not always certain. Discussion and criticism were the natural result. We know too little about Herakleides and Aristoxenos, but F 218 shows Ph.'s attitude towards Comedy clearly and distinctly, while F 217 and 221 25 belong as clearly to the domain of (biographical?) interpretation.

(217) Herakleides of Pontos had treated Protagoras ἐν τοῖς Περὶ νόμων <sup>1</sup>) (we do not know whether he included biographic statements), and of the comic poets at least Eupolis had mentioned him <sup>2</sup>). Judging from the context F 217 cannot refer either to the (uncertain) journey to Thurioi 30 in 444/3 B.C. or to that made in order to deliver lectures which Plato mentions in *Hippi. mai.* p. 228 DE, but only to the alleged flight from Athens on account of the often mentioned trial ἀσεβείας <sup>3</sup>). This charge is dated in 412/1 B.C. by Diog. Laert. 9, 54 κατηγόρησε δ' αὐτοῦ Πυθόδωρος <ὁ> Πολυζήλου, εἰς τῶν τετρακοσίων <sup>4</sup>), and this date allows not only of 35 referring Euripidean verses to Protagoras, it also provides an approximate date for the *Ixion*. The term αἰνίττεσθαι shows that Protagoras was not mentioned by name <sup>5</sup>). If there was a dispute about the lines, it did not concern the time but the circumstances of his death. Perhaps there were other points of contention, too. But it is doubtful whether the subsequent

sentence in Diog. Laert. — *ἔνιοι κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν τελευτῆσαι αὐτόν, βιώσαντα πρὸς τὰ ἔτη ἐνενήκοντα* — contains another tradition about the manner of Protagoras' death <sup>6</sup>). The sentence stands without any connexion, and it seems more likely that Diogenes believed the corruption  $\bar{\eta}$  from  $\bar{o}$  occurring in one of his sources to represent another version about the duration of Protagoras' life. In any case, the section following the quotation of Ph. deals with the age of the sophist, not with the manner of his death.

(218) Athen. 10, 24 p. 424 EF Θεόφραστος γοῦν ἐν τῷ Περὶ μέθης (F 119 Wi) φησί· «*πυθάνομαι δ' ἔγωγε καὶ Εὐριπίδην τὸν ποιητὴν οἰνοχοεῖν Ἀθηνησι τοῖς ὀρχησταῖς καλουμένοις· ὠρχοῦντο δὲ οὗτοι περὶ τὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος νεῶν τοῦ Δηλίου <sup>1</sup>*), τῶν πρώτων ὄντες Ἀθηναίων, καὶ ἐνεδύοντο ἱμάτια τῶν Θηραϊκῶν. ὁ δὲ Ἀπόλλων οὗτός ἐστιν ὧι τὰ Θαργήλια ἄγουσι, καὶ διασώζεται Φλυῆσιν (Valck φυλησι A) ἐν τῷ Δαφνηφορεῖω γραφῇ περὶ τούτων». τὰ αὐτὰ <sup>15</sup> ἴστορεῖ καὶ Ἰερώνυμος ὁ Ῥόδιος, Ἀριστοτέλους ὡν μαθητῆς, καὶ οὗτος ἐν τῷ Περὶ μέθης. The incidental remarks of Theophrastos can, of course, not have been the source of Ph., but the converse relation is not impossible. If one of the two did consult the temple-archives (for that is what *γραφῇ* means, not a painting) it must have been Ph. <sup>2</sup>). Whether he was the first <sup>20</sup> to do so we cannot tell, but it does not appear unlikely. Theophrastos also, by the words τῶν πρώτων ὄντες Ἀθηναίων, refutes incidentally (and this again favours the assumption that he had before him a βίος of Euripides) the *κάπηλος* of the *Vita* I p. 1, 2 Schw. and the *λαχανόπωλις* of Comedy <sup>3</sup>) which Theopompos <sup>4</sup>) had accepted as it stood. Perhaps the term used by <sup>25</sup> Theophrastos is more appropriate to enlighten us about the social position of Euripides' family than the τῶν σφόδρα εὐγενῶν in the quotation from Ph., which may have passed through several hands <sup>5</sup>): in late authors the term *εὐγενής* is a weak foundation for an assumption that 'the mother Kleito was of noble birth' <sup>6</sup>). Certainly a marriage such as is described in <sup>30</sup> *Nub.* 42 ff. is not impossible, and F 218 speaks of the mother only, for whose family Ph. 'conducted the proof'. But the social position of an Athenian citizen and his right to participate in certain cults depend on the social status of his father, and Theophrastos proves two things: the father of Euripides also belonged to the 'notables' <sup>7</sup>), and he kept up <sup>35</sup> the contact with his deme <sup>8</sup>), which may signify that he lived in the country and in his deme. Actually he has mostly been regarded as a landed proprietor, and the comic invention of the *λαχανόπωλις* has been explained by this very fact. It was certainly not the only idle tale expressly refuted by Ph.; it is, for instance, hard to believe that he simply

repeated the gossip about Euripides' married life which we find e.g. in Satyros.

(219) Satyros *Vit. Eurip.* P. Ox. 1176 fr. 39 col. IX 4 [κεκτη]μένος δ' [αὐ]-  
 τόθι σπήλαιον τὴν ἀναπνοὴν ἔχον εἰς τὴν θάλατταν, ἐν τούτῳ διημέρευεν καθ'  
 5 αὐτὸν μεριμνῶν ἀεὶ τι καὶ γράφων ἀπλῶς ἅπαν εἴ τι μὴ μεγαλείον ἢ σεμνὸν ἢ [τι]-  
 μακρῶς· ὁ γοῦν Ἀριστοφάνης (—) φησὶν «ὥσπερ ἐπ' αὐτῷ τούτῳ κεκλημέ-  
 νος, οἷα μὲν ποιεῖ λέγειν τοῖος ἐστίν». *Vita* 5 p. 4, 23 Schw. φασὶ δ' αὐτὸν ἐν  
 Σαλαμῖνι σπήλαιον κατασκευάσαντα ἀναπνοὴν ἔχον εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν ἐκεῖσε  
 διημερεύειν φεύγοντα τὸν ὄχλον· ὅθεν καὶ ἐκ θαλάσσης λαμβάνει τὰς πλείους  
 10 τῶν ὁμοιώσεων. σκυθρωπὸς δὲ καὶ σύνουος καὶ αὐστηρὸς ἐφαίνετο καὶ μισογέλως,  
 καθὰ καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος <sup>1)</sup> αὐτὸν αἰτιᾶται «στρυφνὸς ἔμοιγε προσειπεῖν». *Ibid.*  
 p. 5. 11 αἱ δὲ γυναικες ἐβουλήθησαν αὐτὸν κτείνειν εἰσελθοῦσαι εἰς τὸ  
 σπήλαιον, ἐν ᾧ γράφων διετέλει <sup>2)</sup>).

There can be no doubt that the σπήλαιον was shown to tourists at the  
 15 time of Ph. as well as three centuries later to Gellius, and there can be as  
 little doubt that it was the same: Wilamowitz <sup>3)</sup> overlooked the fact that  
 the story paints Euripides as another Timon, and that his abode is describ-  
 ed as one imagines the character of its inhabitant to have been — σκυθρω-  
 πὸς τὸ ἦθος καὶ ἀμειδῆς καὶ φεύγων τὰς συνουσίας, ὅθεν καὶ μισογύνης  
 20 ἐδοξάσθη <sup>4)</sup>. Anybody assuming on the basis of Satyros' κεκτημένος and of  
 the κατασκευάσας of the *Vita* that the misanthropic poet (at least he was  
 described thus) had built himself a 'cottage' with a sea-view in quiet  
 Salamis can perhaps not be strictly refuted. But the tradition mentions  
 25 unanimously a 'cave', evidently in the 'white cliffs' of Salamis, which he  
 arranged for himself; and however one values that tradition, whether or  
 not one traces it back to a comic poet, it does not support the inferences  
 built on it in regard to the situation of Euripides' parental estate <sup>5)</sup>. All  
 we know about Euripides contradicts: distinguished families did not  
 live in Salamis where kleruchs had been settled; when the poet was a boy  
 30 the family took an active share in the cults of its deme Phlya <sup>6)</sup>; Aristo-  
 phanes *Ach.* 393 ff. makes the poet compose his plays in his town-house,  
 although he jealously guards his quiet life; even in the *Thesmophoriazusae*  
 Aristophanes knows nothing about Salamis <sup>7)</sup>. Whether the story of the  
 Salaminian cave be true or not, and if not however it may have arisen,  
 35 I believe it to be due to this story that the *Vita* 1 p. 1, 3 and a late herm  
 from Velitrae <sup>8)</sup> make Euripides be born in Salamis; the almost generally  
 assumed date of his birth in 480/79 B.C., which, however, is not Philo-  
 chorean, could be used as a confirmation <sup>9)</sup>. We should be pleased to know  
 what Ph. really related of the cave, whether he actually believed the

story of Euripides having composed his plays there. But to this and to similar questions the scrap that has been preserved furnishes no answer.

(220) Wilamowitz seems to have explained the 'more than seventy years of life' correctly: the calculation was based upon the documentary date of the first performance in 456/5 B.C. <sup>1)</sup> and the year of his death in 407/6 B.C., given by the performance of Aristophanes' *Ranae* in 406/5 B.C. which again was documentary. If Ph. assumed that the poet was at least twenty years old <sup>2)</sup> when he obtained his first chorus the result was 476/5 B.C. as the latest year for his birth and at least seventy years of life. In exactly the same manner an unfortunately unknown author calculated in regard to Thukydidēs: *παύσασθαι δὲ τὸν βίον ὑπὲρ τὰ πενήκοντα ἔτη* <sup>3)</sup>. The method of contenting oneself with a minimum figure when the material does not allow of more accurate statements shows the caution of the true scholar, which ought to be appreciated all the more as Ph. probably already had the choice between two synchronisms fixing the birth precisely to the year: the (or one of the) source(s) of the Parian Marble concerned with history of literature, possibly Aristoxenos <sup>4)</sup>, assigned the birth to the year 485/4 B.C. in which *Αἰσχύλος ὁ ποιητὴς τραγωιδίαι πρῶτον ἐνίκησε* <sup>5)</sup>; the other synchronism with the battle of Salamis which yields 75 years of life <sup>6)</sup> also gives the impression of being earlier than Eratosthenes, whose authority made it the accepted date <sup>7)</sup>. It is doubtful <sup>8)</sup> whether Ph. mentioned at least the latter date which did not so absolutely contradict his cautious wording as the almost eighty years of the Parian Marble. We shall not doubt that he recorded the death of the poet in Macedonia, but we do not know in that instance either if he gave particulars of the death round which, as round the birth, fables had grown, and if he did, what the particulars were <sup>9)</sup>.

(221) It may be accidental that Diogenes omitted the address *ὦ Δαναοί*; in any case it is of no importance, for in a chorus nothing but allusions <sup>30</sup> (*αἰνίττεσθαι*) are possible <sup>1)</sup>. The supposed reference to Sokrates also occurs in the hypothesis of Isokrates' *Busiris* <sup>2)</sup> where the chronology is quite wild. That interpretation is a particularly good example of this kind of scholarship because the criticism of Ph. indicates that some of the worst misinterpretations are early, *i.e.* pre-Hellenistic. The refutation was <sup>35</sup> easy enough: the *Palamedes* was performed in 476/5 B.C. <sup>3)</sup>, seventeen years before the death of Sokrates, and that was what Ph. stated. What we should like to know is whether Ph., who did not deny in principle the possibility of such allusions in tragedy (F 217), gave another interpretation of those lines, and particularly whether he acknowledged

personal or other relations between the poet and the philosopher at all. He could not altogether pass over this question, for in this respect, too, the inventions of Comedy had to be refuted because they had to a certain degree influenced fourth century biography and history of literature <sup>4</sup>).

5 (222) There seem to have been two actors of the name of Polos, an Athenian in the last third of the fifth century whom Lucian calls Πῶλος Χαρικλέους Σουნიεύς ὀνομαζόμενος <sup>1</sup>), and an Aeginetan ὑπερβάλλον τῆι τέχνῃ πάντας, pupil of Archias Phygadotheras <sup>2</sup>), in the late fourth century. If the latter was meant the most likely place for the fragment would  
 10 be the *Atthis*, in the later detailed books of which matters like that may quite well have been mentioned, not necessarily in the context of F 164 Lut perhaps in the description of the reign of the Phalerean Demetrios or the next years <sup>3</sup>). If it is the former (and that seems more probable) one of the books about tragic poets and Tragedy would be preferable. Περὶ  
 15 ἀγώνων <sup>4</sup>) would be equally unlikely for either.

(223) This fragment is important because it shows that the Peripatetics did not wait half a millennium for Aristokles of Messana <sup>1</sup>) to refute the malicious gossip about the relation of Aristotle to Plato spread not only in writings from the circle of the Academy but in those of contemp-  
 20 orary historians, too. The Peripatetics were surely obliged to defend at once their master against the insults levelled at the ὀψιμαθῆς by Epikuros and Timaios (566 F 156/7), and the arguments on both sides were certainly discussed in the 'peripatetic' biography of the third century. We can hardly exaggerate the acrimony of the dispute, nor must we be deceived by  
 25 the facts that the primary material either has largely been lost, or that the authors of what we have cannot be determined accurately either as to their time or otherwise <sup>2</sup>). For no Hellenistic biography of Aristotle is left, only late descendants and summaries, some of them badly confused. It is exceedingly regrettable that Philodemos does not yield anything  
 30 about this special question <sup>3</sup>). But in any case the *Vita Marciana* still quotes Ph., and I have copied the whole context in which the quotation occurs although I am not sure that it tells us anything essential. The dates and the biographic facts are to prove (and they do as far as they go) that the Peripatos was not a rival institution founded in the lifetime of  
 35 Plato. Anybody acquainted with the history of the time could refute that charge as easily as the referring of a passage in a Euripidean chorus to the death of Sokrates (F 221); one may almost say that just this neglect of dates (which later form an ingredient of general education) is actual evidence for the contemporary origin of such an assertion <sup>4</sup>). The *Vita*



conducts its counter-proof in two ways: (1) directly on the basis of the acknowledged chronology of Apollodoros <sup>5</sup>) according to which Aristotle came to Plato when he was 17 or 18 years old in 367/6 B.C. <sup>6</sup>) and remained with him for twenty years until his death; (2) indirectly by repudiating the contention that Aristotle had been forty years old when he came to Plato <sup>7</sup>). According to the wording Ph. seems to have contradicted that obviously malevolent contention (which makes Aristotle an *ὄψιμαθής*). It is surprising that for this purpose Ph. should simply have accepted as given facts both the 63 years of life and the twenty years of membership <sup>10</sup> with the Academy <sup>8</sup>), though it may not be incredible for a man who treated the history of his own time in detail and who seems to have known much about the distinguished philosophers, no matter whether he entered into his *Atthis* the changes of the heads of the schools regularly or in certain cases only (F 224 ?). But the quotation from him looks like an addition <sup>15</sup> insufficiently attached to an abbreviated context: his argument (*καὶ ὅτι οὐδὲ εἰκὸς κτλ.*) is sound and clear; he refutes the fundamental reproach of a rival foundation by the disloyal disciple by adducing objective considerations which show the expert in constitutional law and in political conditions. He is distinctly speaking of the time when Plato <sup>20</sup> ruled the school: Chabrias died in 357 B.C., Timotheos shortly after 354 <sup>9</sup>). There is not the least doubt about *what* he polemizes against, even if we cannot tell against *whom*, and whether he has a certain author in view at all or only the mass of written attacks and the *communis opinio* <sup>10</sup>). The argument is valid for the time when Athens was independent: in <sup>25</sup> 306 B.C. at the latest, when Sophokles carried his law which was directed against the Peripatos (it was abolished in the next year), Ph. must have perceived how these matters were interwoven with politics <sup>11</sup>)—if he needed a particular event to recognize the political background. It is conceivable that on this occasion he dealt retrospectively and at some length <sup>30</sup> with the relation of the Peripatos to the Academy (and perhaps to other schools, too). In any case, we may assign F 223-224 to the *Atthis* because of F 59.

(224) Diog. Laert. 4, I διεδέξατο δὲ αὐτὸν Σπεύσιππος Εὐρυμέδοντος Ἀθηναῖος, τῶν μὲν δῆμων Μυρρινούσιος, υἱὸς δὲ τῆς ἀδελφῆς αὐτοῦ Ποτῶνης, καὶ <sup>35</sup> ἐσχολάρχῃσεν ἕτη ὀκτώ, ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς ἡ καὶ ῥ Ὀλυμπιάδος, Χαρίτων τ' ἀγάλματα ἀνέθηκεν ἐν τῷ Μουσεῖῳ τῷ ὑπὸ Πλάτωνος ἐν Ἀκαδημαίῳ ἰδρυθέντι. . . (3) ἤδη δὲ ὑπὸ παραλύσεως καὶ τὸ σῶμα διέφθαρτο, καὶ πρὸς Ξενοκράτην διέπέμπετο παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν ἐλθεῖν καὶ τὴν σχολὴν διαδέξασθαι. I do not think that we can assign to Ph. more than the information about the

dedication with the text of the epigram. He seems to be cited in col. II for another epigram (F 59), and in the text of col. VI the repetition of the name distinctly shows the insertion <sup>1)</sup> which is perhaps to be blamed for the confusion in the text: in the beginning the so-called scholion ἄτ' ὦν Πορώνης υἱὸς proves that some words dropped out which explained the election of Speusippos <sup>2)</sup>, and the disorder in the text following the quotation of Ph. is made evident by the additions above the line which make v. 38 twice as long as the others. That is annoying, for as the text stands now γράφει seems to introduce another quotation from Ph., from which we might have learned whether he entered regularly the duration of each *scholarchate*. That is, of course, conceivable; nor would the connexion be impossible of Speusippos' state of health (v. 38 can only be understood as a reference to it), which may have been bad already at the time of his becoming head of the school, with the short duration of his leadership.

But the natural connexion in a history of the Academy would have been Σπεύσιππος παρ' αὐτοῦ διεδέξατο τὴν διατριβὴν κατέστρεψέν τε κτλ. as it is in Diogenes. It is certain that Philodemos gave another quotation for the illness: this is corroborated by the paragraphos between lines 38/9 which is placed in the same manner as that in col. VIII 11/2 at the quotation of ἔνιοι and 17/8 at that from Timaios. It remains uncertain whether he took the second quotation from Ph., too; perhaps it is more likely that in l. 38, in which the supplements are doubtful, another author's name was contained. Anyone not acknowledging the insertion from Ph. (no matter whether it consists in one or two quotations) must assign to the Atthidographer the whole *Vita* down to col. VIII 11, where the variants begin, the reports from ἔνιοι and Timaios which were hostile to Xenokrates. That is not credible though one wishes it were. But the good report about the election of Xenokrates with the statements as to the conduct of the defeated candidates at least throws some light on F 223 and possibly determines its position. If ἔτ' οὔσας is correctly supplemented the quotation from Ph. is perhaps not direct; it may have been brought in through a biographer who wrote 'après les ravages des Macédoniens en 200 et surtout après le siège d'Athènes par Sylla en 86' <sup>3)</sup>, i.e. by Philodemos' main source, the 'Biographer of the Academy'. To the same biographer may belong the term Μουσεῖον for what is otherwise called περίπατος, σχολή, διατριβή <sup>4)</sup>. I do not imagine that my supplement is necessarily correct, but we expect a qualification of the time like that implied in Diogenes, and in the generally assumed supplement καὶ κατεχοῦσας not only the position is surprising but particularly the reference to

the Charites <sup>5</sup>). On the other hand, it seems to be certain that the source of Diogenes by Μουσεῖον means the temenos of the Muses.

(225—226) In comparison with Androtion and even with Phanodemos the fragments of Ph., as far as they can be assigned to the *Atthis* with any  
5 certainty (and that is not the case with F 225/6), yield hardly anything not referring to Attica. That can hardly be a mere accident, but I cannot explain it. Cf. also p. 351 f. on the Ὀλυμπιάδες.

(225) Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἐλλοπία· <sup>1</sup>) χωρίον Εὐβοίας, καὶ αὐτὴ (ν αὐτῆ ο) ἡ νῆσος ἀπὸ Ἐλλοπος τοῦ Ἴωνος <sup>2</sup>)· . . . ἐλέγετο καὶ ἡ περὶ Δωδώνῃν χώρα  
10 Ἐλλοπία, ἧς οἱ οἰκῆτορες Ἐλλοῖ καὶ Σελλοῖ· Ὀμηρος ἀμφὶ (Hom. ἀπὸ ο) δὲ Σελλοῖ». ἔστι δὲ πόλις περὶ (VP παρὰ R) Δολοπιαν <sup>3</sup>) καὶ χώρα περὶ Θεσπιάς <sup>4</sup>). Schol. Soph. *Trach.* 1167 Σελλῶν ἐσελθὼν ἄλσος] ἐνιοὶ δὲ χωρὶς τοῦ σ γράφουσιν Ἐλλοῦς ἀποδεχόμενοι, καὶ Ἐλλοπιαν τὴν Δωδώνῃν νομίζουσιν εἶναι· τὴν γὰρ χώραν οὕτως Ἡσίοδος ὀνομάζει ἐν Ἠοίαις (F 134 Rz <sup>3</sup>) λέγων οὕτως·  
15 ἔστι τις Ἐλλοπιή πολυλήϊος ἡδ' εὐλείμων . . . ἐνθα δὲ Δωδώνῃ τις ἐπ' ἔσχατιῇ πεπόλιται· τὴν δὲ Ζεὺς ἐφίλησε, καὶ δν χρηστήριον εἶναι τίμιον ἀνθρώποις \* \* ναῖον δ' ἐν πυθμένι φηγοῦ . . . <sup>5</sup>)». ἐντεῦθεν δὲ λέγουσιν εἶναι Ἐλλοπιεῖς καὶ τοὺς ἐν Εὐβοίαι οἰκήσαντας <sup>6</sup>).

The idea that Ph. wrote Ἠπειρωτικά <sup>7</sup>) is unfounded, whereas the possibility that the Euboean Ellopia occurred in the *Atthis* <sup>8</sup>) can as little be  
20 denied as that of Ph. having on some occasion mentioned Dodona in the course of his historical entries <sup>9</sup>). The passage transcribed by Strabo from Demetrios of Skepsis <sup>10</sup>) is evidently the epitome of a rather full treatment of the place-name Ἐλλοπία. The enumeration of the regions in Euboea and  
25 Epirus points to a discussion of the famous Homeric passage Π 233/5 Ζεῦ ἄνα, Δωδωναίε, Πελασγικέ, τηλόθι ναίων, / Δωδώνης μεδέων δυσχειμέρου· ἀμφὶ δὲ Σελλοῖ / σοὶ ναίουσ' ὑποφῆται ἀνιπτόποδες, χαμκιεῦναι, and as we do not know of a special book by Ph. about Homer and / or Homeric problems <sup>11</sup>) we may suggest Περὶ μαντικῆς as the place of provenience with a fair  
30 amount of certainty. If Ph. treated the great oracles at all he cannot have omitted Dodona; and whoever wrote about Dodona could not pass over Homer if only because that passage touched on the question how and by whom the oracles were issued. The passage of Homer was interpreted differently probably at all times and certainly in the fifth century:  
35 Sophokles *Trach.* 1167 read Σελλοῖ, the Hesiod of the *Eoëa* cited by Ph. σ' Ἐλλοῖ, as did Pindar in the paeon on the Zeus of Dodona <sup>12</sup>), and the rhapsodes may have had explanations for either reading. But it is doubtful whether we may date back to the fifth century, and even more pronounce as being 'in the main undoubtedly correct' <sup>13</sup>) the opinion of a

5 grammarian who polemized against the reading of Aristarchos Σελλοί: Schol. T p. 176, 31 M εὐάν δὲ εἴπωμεν «Σελλοί», ἔσονται περὶ πᾶσαν τὴν Δωδώνην οἰκούντες, οὐ περὶ τὸ τέμενος τοῦ θεοῦ· «εὐάν δὲ εἴπωμεν «Ἐλλοί», ἔσονται οἱ περὶ τὸ τέμενος, δ><sup>14</sup>) καὶ βέλτιον· ἐν Δωδώνῃ γὰρ τὸ γένος ἐστὶ τῶν ἱερέων τοῦ Διὸς κατὰ διαδοχὴν. True, the distinction between tribe and clan is rather early: Alexandros of Pleuron (Schol. A p. 105, 3 Ddf) opines ἔθνος εἶναι τοὺς Ἐλλοὺς ἀπόγονον Τυρρηνῶν, καὶ διὰ πατρῶιον ἔθος οὕτω τὸν Δία θρησκεύειν, and Andron<sup>15</sup>), whom the Scholiast quoted before him, also took them for a people, though it cannot be stated with certainty whether
 10 he too read Ἐλλοί. But the statement of Alexander sufficiently proves that the question whether they were a clan or a people is independent from the reading. The late grammarian, pleased with his argument (which in fact was not new), overlooked the fact that the relation of the Selloi/Helloi to Zeus is sufficiently indicated by σοι ὑποφῆται, and no hearer could
 15 have failed to understand ἀμφί. As to Ph., the comparison generally and the words περὶ Δωδώνην τόπον in particular allow of the inference that at any rate he did not share the artificial view of the late grammarian, while it remains uncertain whether he took Helloi for the priests or for a tribe living in and around Dodona; the reference to the passage of 'Hesiod',
 20 which is unfortunately defective, does not help to decide the question. The point is not of great importance, it is much more regrettable that nothing has been preserved of what he had to say about the oracle itself and its management<sup>16</sup>).

(226) About the reliability in general of Theodotios to whom Landi
 25 traces back the quotation see Introd. p. 240 f. The metamorphosis, first attested by the Λυκισκὰ of Menekrates of Xanthos<sup>1</sup>), later by Nikandros' Ἐτεροιούμενα and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*<sup>2</sup>), gives the impression of a popular story because of the statements about the place (perhaps a malicious joke about some dear neighbour), not certainly of a genuine
 30 legend from the history of the Lycian Leto. The story has been rationalized by being made an event in a war between Rhodes and Lycia which cannot be determined accurately<sup>3</sup>). Nor do we know who the *Delones* are who appear as the allies of the Rhodians; the name may be corrupt; the Thracian *Doliones*<sup>4</sup>), who are settled in the region of Kyzikos, have no
 35 business here. Neither the substance of the story nor its manner of rationalization looks like Ph., and it is difficult to tell where he could have reported anything of the kind. Perhaps I had better have assigned the story to the *Dubia*.

(227—230) I have not admitted Harpokrat. Epit. s.v. Βούχερα (see

F 225 n. 7) and Schol. Sophkl. *O. C.* 39, where Hecker *Philol.* 4 p. 489 and others substitute Φιλόχορος for Φύλαρχος (81 F 82) without sufficient reasons.

(227) The so-called Apuleius *De orthographia* is a forgery of the re-naissance<sup>1)</sup> the quotations from which are altogether untrustworthy: Serapion of Rhodes and Lupus Anilius are unknown<sup>2)</sup> and seem to be invented; Ph. (if he is meant at all<sup>3)</sup>) gave a different account of Theseus<sup>4)</sup>. The story implies that Ariadne and Phaedra, being the daughters of Minos and Pasiphae, are sisters, and that the former belongs to Theseus, the latter to Hippolytos. But the marriage of Hippolytos and Phaedra has been transferred from the story of Theseus as it is narrated e.g. in *Bibl. epit.* 1, 17 ff.; thus also *uxore necata* can be explained: what is meant is the first wife of Theseus, the Amazon, who together with the other Amazons attacked the palace when Theseus celebrated his marriage with Phaedra, and was slain<sup>5)</sup>. The inserted sentence with the quotations is altogether unintelligible: as Theseus is the subject something like the Prokne-Philomela story would be the result, but then Phaedra could not complain to Theseus. An attempt at disentangling the confusion by making conjectures is useless, and it would be a mistake to refer the citation of Ph. to one trait in the story as e.g. to the oracle of Pasiphae, which might have occurred in *Περὶ μαντικῆς*<sup>6)</sup>.

(228) Schol. Apoll. Rhod. 2, 140 a Φινέως παῖδες ἐκ μὲν Κλεοπάτρας Παρθένιος καὶ Κλάραμβις, ἐκ δὲ Ἰδαίας τῆς Δαρδάνου ἢ Σκυθικῆς τινος παλλακίδος Θυνός καὶ Μαριανδυνός, ἐξ ὧν τὰ ἔθνη κέκληνται· οἱ δὲ φασὶ κεκληθῆσθαι τοὺς Μαριανδυνούς ἀπὸ Μαριανδυνοῦ υἱοῦ Κιμμερίου. *Ibid.* 2, 178/82 c ὅτι δὲ ἤρχεν ὁ Φινεύς μέχρι τοῦ Βοσπόρου Θραικῶν πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ (εἰσὶ δ' οὗτοι Βιθυνοὶ τε καὶ Παφλαγόνες) Φερεκύδης ἐν τῇ ζ (3 F 27) φησί . . . παῖδας δὲ αὐτοῦ φασὶ<sup>1)</sup> γενέσθαι Μαριανδυνόν καὶ Θυνόν, καὶ ἀπὸ μὲν Θυνοῦ Θυνηίδα, ἀπὸ δὲ Μαριανδυνοῦ Μαριανδυνίαν προσαγορευθῆναι λέγουσιν. Schol. Eust. Dionys. *Perieg.* 793 τοὺς τε Θυνούς καὶ τοὺς Βιθυνοῦς, οὕτω καλουμένους ἀπὸ τινῶν ἀδελφῶν ἐπιφανῶν Θυνοῦ καὶ Βιθυνοῦ, παίδων Φινέως κατὰ ποίησιν, ἧτοι ποιητῶν καὶ θετῶν, καθά φησιν Ἀρριανός (156 F 77), ὃς καὶ γνήσιον παῖδα Φινέως ἱστορεῖ Παφλαγόνια, ἐξ οὗ χώρα Παφλαγονία. The possibility of Natalis Comes having had access to fuller scholia through one of his sources cannot be strictly denied<sup>2)</sup>, and that Ph. may have mentioned the sons of Phineus may after all also be possible if one thinks of Phylarchos (81 F 17) who related that Asklepios cured them *χαρίζομενος αὐτῶν τῇ μητρὶ Κλεοπάτραι τῇ Ἐρεχθέως*. I am not at all sure that the conjecture has any probability, and Ph. certainly did not tell the Argonaut story in detail.

(229) Schol. Thukyd. 2, 15 4 Λίμναι τόπος ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει τῶν Ἀθηναίων. Schol. V Aristoph. *Ran.* 216 (more briefly Steph. Byz. s.v. Λίμναι) Λίμναι δὲ χωρίον (τόπος Steph. Byz.) τῆς Ἀττικῆς, ἐν ᾧ Διονύσου ἱερὸν. (RV) Λίμνη τόπος ἱερὸς Διονύσου, ἐν ᾧ και οἶκος και νεὼς τοῦ θεοῦ. Καλλίμαχος ἐν 5 Ἐκάλῃ (F 305 Pf.) « Λιμναίωι δὲ χοροστάδας ἤγον ἑορτάς ». Hesych. s.v. Λίμναι · ἐν Ἀθήναις τόπος ἀνεϊμένος Διονύσου, ὅπου τὰ Λήναια ἤγετο. Any attempt at supplementing the passage encounters the difficulty that the gaps at the ends of the lines are too small: μέν φησιν with the corresponding -ος δέ makes it certain that the name of an author preceded which can 10 only be Kallimachos; there is no room for two quotations, and τὸν ποτ' Ἐλευθῆρ already is part of a verse. But it is possible that the Scholiast abbreviated <sup>1)</sup>, paraphrasing the opening words. If the supplement of Wilamowitz <sup>2)</sup> is even approximately correct, the difference in the two citations is obvious for all their incompleteness. Kallimachos, in a most 15 concise clause, states the identity of Διόνυσος ἐν Λίμναις with Ἐλευθερέως <sup>3)</sup> not expatiating (as far as we see) upon the cult-name; people celebrate festivals with choral dances for Dionysos Melanaigis (?), whose cult-image Eleuther has presented, in his quality of Limnaios. The second author, of whose name only the final -ος is preserved and who certainly was a 20 prose-writer <sup>4)</sup>, explains the cult-name (or that of the town-quarter) from the nature of the ground on which the sanctuary was situated: διὰ τὸ ἐκλελιμνάσθαι [τὸν τόπον]. This is a conjecture <sup>5)</sup> referring to the past, as we learn from Strabo 8, 5, 1 who says of Sparta (which is situated ἐν κοιλοτέρωι χωρίωι) οὐδέν γε μέρος αὐτοῦ λιμνάζει, τὸ δὲ παλαιὸν ἐλίμναζε τὸ προάσ- 25 τειον, και ἐκάλουν αὐτὸ Λίμνας, comparing the Athenian Limnai: και τὸ τοῦ Διονύσου ἱερὸν ἐν Λίμναις ἐφ' ὕγραυ βεβηκὸς ἐτύγγανε, νῦν δ' ἐπὶ ξηροῦ τῆν ἰδρυσιν ἔχει <sup>6)</sup>. This comparison may prove important for supplementing the name of the author: in an interpretative scholion we expect 30 mentioned by the poet, not a commentator on Thukydides <sup>7)</sup>. An Attidographer would be suitable, and [Φιλόχορ]ος seems to fit the gap. Unfortunately we do not know how he explained the Διόνυσος ἐν Λίμναις <sup>8)</sup>, and [Φανόδημ]ος (with whom he may well have agreed) gives an entirely different explanation: ὅτι μιχθὲν τὸ γλεῦκος τῷ ὕδατι τότε πρῶτον ἐπόθη κεκρα- 35 μένον (325 F 12). [Διόδωρ]ος (the periegetes no. 372) was only proposed because the name is brief enough. I prefer to take the opposite course recommended not by the state of the papyrus but by the matter and by the passage of Strabo. The method applied by the latter and in the shortened scholion is obviously the method of Apollodoros <sup>9)</sup>, and the

supplement [<sup>10</sup>Ἀπολλόδωρος] is the most likely one even though the name seems to be a little too long for the gap, and we should have to assume that it was abbreviated <sup>10</sup>).

(230) Perhaps Usener (*Kl. Schr.* I p. 207) was overcautious when in 5 restoring the fragment of Androtion he remarked that the corruption of the third ambassador's name might be due to a marginal addition καὶ Φιλόχορος. It is certain that the Scholiast himself quoted Androtion.

### 329. ΟΙ ΤΑΣ ΑΤΘΙΔΑΣ ΣΥΓΓΡΑΨΑΝΤΕΣ

#### INTRODUCTION

<sup>10</sup> The collective quotations, not from 'the Atthis' but from 'the Atthidographers' as a group handing down a tradition <sup>1</sup>), must be inserted here because they throw a certain light on the species. The few genuine quotations of this kind derive from learned Hellenistic authors, for whom references to a whole group are natural when comparing Attic tradition <sup>15</sup> with e.g. that of Argos or with a general one, perhaps of epic poetry or of some other literary *genre*. It is the method occasionally applied already by Herodotos <sup>2</sup>). Therefore a passage like Plutarch. *Kimon* 4,7 does not belong here: ὁ δὲ Πολύγνωτος . . . οὐδ' ἀπ' ἐργολαβίας ἔγραφε τὴν στοᾶν ἀλλὰ <sup>20</sup> προῖκα, φιλοτιμούμενος πρὸς τὴν πόλιν, ὡς οἱ τε συγγραφεῖς ἱστοροῦσι καὶ Με- λάνθιος ὁ ποιητής. No doubt Philochoros at least among the Atthidographers entered the building of the Stoa Poikile, and he is likely to have added Πολυγνώτου προῖκα γράψαντος αὐτήν <sup>3</sup>); but συγγραφεῖς is used in quite a general sense of prose-writers as opposed to poets and probably refers to Plutarch's customary biographical sources. Pausanias with his stilted <sup>25</sup> mode of expression <sup>4</sup>) surely means *Atthides*, although one cannot feel certain of his having consulted directly even one of them. F 3, taken from a chronographer, is rather an anonymous than a collective quotation: it seems to have noted discrepancies between Atthidographers. F 2 and 4 show that the Hellenistic scholars sometimes adduced indi- <sup>30</sup> vidual authors besides the group for points not included in the general tradition, perhaps also for divergences from it. Plutarch's occasional emphasis on the particular character of a certain account <sup>5</sup>) may go back to his source (Istros?). The number of collective quotations is small: Hellenistic learned literature, in which they must have been frequent, is <sup>35</sup> lost; Lexicographers and Scholiasts usually cite only the *Atthis* they prefer, mostly Philochoros, or give a divergent tradition with the name

of its author. In many cases they may not have cited at all if there were no discrepancies or none of importance, in even more cases the quotations dropped out of our abridged tradition.

#### T(estimonies)

- 5 I have not inserted here the famous characterization of the so-called logographers preserved by Dion. Hal. *De Thuc.* 5 because it is not concerned with the *Atthides*, not even with local chronicles generally, but with the earliest writers of history, the alleged predecessors of Herodotos and Thukydides: of the authors enumerated here Hekataios is certainly  
 10 not a local historian at all, Hellanikos and Charon are such only in part of their work. (1) This testimony is important because of the quite general evidence for the design of the *Atthides*. The *Anonymus Argentinensis* (F 6) seems actually to cite his Atthidographic sources as Χρονογραφῆαι. (2) Both the arrangement and the individual statements favour  
 15 the assumption of a well-informed source. Apollodoros also calls attention to the material divergences between different *Atthides* (see on F 2).

#### F(ragments)

- (1) The fragment derives from Demetrios of Skepsis (Schwartz). For the matter see on Philochoros 328 F 99-101.
- 20 (2) The fragment is taken from Apollodoros of Athens; see on Philochoros 328 F 107.
- (3) The fragment probably derives from a later chronographer <sup>1)</sup> who compared Argive and Athenian dates, adding equations of regnal years (eighteenth year of Agamemnon = first year of Demophon) and even of  
 25 months (Panamos = Thargelion or Skirophorion). It is annoying that Clement, while mentioning by name authors for Argos, cites for Athens τινές and ἕτεροι anonymously. According to this chronographer the Atthidographers differed as to the month of the sack of Troy, some giving the last month, some the last but one of the Attic year; we do not see why,  
 30 and Skirophorion is mentioned only here, Thargelion being the month usually named <sup>2)</sup>. The computation of the day of this month is founded on the line in the *Little Iliad*, for μεσονόκτιος δὲ μόνον τῆι ὀγδόῃ φθίνοντος ἀνατέλλει, ἐν ἄλλῃ δ' οὐ <sup>3)</sup>. According as one makes the day begin with the evening or with the morning this is the eighth or the seventh  
 35 day from the end of Thargelion <sup>4)</sup>; the seventh is given by Marm.



Par. A ep. 24<sup>5</sup>) and the historians enumerated by Plutarch *Camill.* 19, viz. Damastes, Ephoros, Kallisthenes, Phylarchos. Kallisthenes<sup>6</sup>) moreover mentioned the date given by Hellanikos, the twelfth of Thargelion, the reason for which we do not know. It is probable  
 5 that the date of Hellanikos, as handed down by Clement, derived from the 'Ιέρειαί, which is earlier than his *Atthis*, not from this book or the 'Αργολικά. In this case we should expect the Argive month, but it is possible that the subject of the Athenian empire, not being able to date  
 10 by the calendar of his home country, was more familiar with the Attic calendar; or Kallisthenes transposed the date. We do not know who first made these calculations; but they are of the fifth century and may therefore belong to the earliest interpreters of Homer. For the seemingly different date of Aischylos *Ag.* 826 ἀμφὶ Πλειάδων δύσιν see the Commentary of Ed. Fraenkel p. 380 ff.

15 (4) See on Philochoros 328 F 117.

(5) Pausan. 8, 48, 2 (in a digression about crowns of victory from various plants) οἱ δὲ ἀγῶνες φοίνικος ἔχουσιν οἱ πολλοὶ στέφανον, ἐς δὲ τὴν δεξιάν ἐστι καὶ πανταχοῦ τῷ νικῶντι ἐστιθέμενος φοινίξ<sup>1</sup>). (3) ἐνομίσθη δὲ ἐπὶ τοιῶνδε· Θησέα ἀνακομιζόμενον ἐκ Κρήτης φασὶν ἐν Δήλῳ ἀγῶνα ποιήσασθαι τῷ 'Απόλλωνι, στεφανοῦν δὲ αὐτὸν τοὺς νικῶντας τῷ φοίνικι. τοῦτο μὲν δὴ ἄρξαι λέγουσιν ἐν-  
 20 τεῦθεν· τοῦ δὲ φοίνικος τοῦ ἐν Δήλῳ μνήμην ἐποίησατο καὶ 'Ομηρος (*Od.* ζ 163). Plutarch's ἐν τοῖς 'Αττικαῖς (cf. T 2; F 3; *Atthis* p. 81 ff.) does not absolutely prove an *Atthis* to be the immediate source<sup>2</sup>), for these things were certainly mentioned also in the books *Περὶ ἀγῶνων*<sup>3</sup>); the aition,  
 25 however, is an Athenian one, and we may suggest that the ultimate source for tracing back the palm crown to Theseus was one of the *Atthises* or of the Athenian books on Delos<sup>4</sup>). The etymology given here would be in accord with this suggestion, for others explain σπάδιξ as a gloss and as the designation of a colour: Prob. Verg. *Ge.* 3, 82 *palmae, cuius iam deficit*  
 30 *color, colorem dicit; Sicut enim palmam, quam Graeci φοίνικα appellant, vocant σπάδιχα. spadiciis color est quem λευκόκυρον vocant, hoc est albus et fuscus.* Gellius *N.A.* 2, 26 nam 'poeniceus', quem tu Graece φοίνικα dixisti, et 'rutilus' et 'spadix' poeniceae συνώνυμος . . . exuberantiam splendoremque significat ruboris, quales sunt fructus palmae arboris non admodum sole  
 35 *incocti, unde spadici et poeniceo nomen est: spadica enim Dorici (δωριστί Hertz, dorice Hosius) vocant avulsum e palma termitem cum fructu.*

(6) Wilcken *Herm.* 42, 1907, p. 409 ff.; Meritt, Wade-Gery, Mc Gregor *ATL* I, 1939, p. 572. For the quotation cf. on T 1.

(7—8) See Text p. 595, 24 ff. About Androgeos see on Philochoros 328

F 11 and on Amelesagoras 330 F 2. On Immarados see Pausan. I, 5, 2; 38, 3; Clem. Al *Protr.* 3, 45, 1; Schol. *Il.* Σ 483; Schol. Eurip. *Phoen.* 854; Robert *Heldensage* p. 141; Eitrem *R. E.* IX col. 1107. The etymology proposed by Elderkin *Hesperia* 10, 1941, p. 116 seems fantastic to me.

5

## 330. AMELESAGORAS

## INTRODUCTION

The enigma of this much discussed figure is perhaps not hard to solve. A Chalcedonian as the author of an *Atthis* before Hellanikos is a phenomenon incredible in itself <sup>1</sup>); actually A. of Chalkedon owes his existence to a gap in the list of early historians negligently transcribed in Dionysios of Halikarnassos <sup>2</sup>). There remain the 'Athenian' of Antigonos of Karystos, whose *Atthis* both Dionysios and Clement have in mind, and the 'Αθήνησιν ἀνήρ 'Ελευσίνιος mentioned by Maximus of Tyre. Their identification is obvious and renders superfluous all complicated hypotheses because it does justice to the testimonies and opens the way for the understanding of the singular book. All the evidence is late, with the exception of Antigonos whose collection of Παράδοξα Wilamowitz places 'about 240 B.C., or even later' <sup>3</sup>); but the sources of the other authors also belong to the Hellenistic period: the list of Dionysios may derive ultimately from Theophrastos' book Περὶ λέξεως <sup>4</sup>); Clement's statements go back to the learned literature Περὶ κλοπῆς; and his approximate contemporary Maximus evidently spins out, in his insupportable fashion, a piece of old tradition, *viz.* the juxtaposition of the three writers Aristeas, Epimenides, Amelesagoras, who all professed to be divinely inspired. It is undisputed that the works of the former two (whether genuine or pseudonymous does not matter here) existed in the fifth century. Until proof is produced that the book of the third, *viz.* 'the Eleusinian prophet', was a forgery of the period of the emperors under the name of a fifth century historian <sup>5</sup>), we shall have to assume that the particulars Maximus supplies about the person of the author come from the preface of the work itself as do those in Herodotos about Aristeas and those in Theopompos and others about Epimenides. This means that the name Amelesagoras (tradition definitely favours this form <sup>6</sup>) existed only in connexion with the *Atthis*, and as A. is not really a human name, the name was invented for the author of that book: the 'Atthis' is not a forgery, it may be called a pseudepigraphon. We are not obliged (and perhaps not

able) to explain a name invented in contradiction to the laws of language, or the sense of the invention, with certainty, but the suggestion of Ed. Schwartz <sup>7)</sup> is very tempting that it was derived from the river in the underworld 'Αμέλης, which Plato *Rep.* X p. 621 A seems to have invented <sup>8)</sup>. It would at the same time furnish a *terminus post* for its publication which agrees with the fact that the first *Atthis* written by an Athenian did not appear until about the middle of the fourth century. The *terminus ante* is obtained from the quotation by Antigonos, and the use Kallimachos almost certainly made of A. in the *Hekale* <sup>9)</sup> moves it up <sup>10</sup> to the first half, probably the seventies, of the third century. We can hardly make a more exact statement. The alleged users of the book, as far as they can be determined as to time, belong to the fifth and fourth centuries; but if the citation of Philochoros refers to his *Atthis* (as it probably does) they would reach down to the first quarter of the third <sup>15</sup> century <sup>10)</sup>: the majority of them, if not all, may be assumed to be sources, not users of A. We shall therefore have to be content with assigning him to the years about 300 B.C. <sup>11)</sup>.

More important than the exact year is in any case the fact that at this early period an 'Atthis' appeared the author of which introduced <sup>20</sup> himself in his preface as an Eleusinian, a very early one presumably, who claimed to be divinely inspired as the 'prophets' Musaios, Epimenides, Aristeas and others had done two centuries earlier in Θεογονίαι, Χρησμοί and reports of travels. This claim means, of course, that the author professed to have greater and better knowledge than his prede- <sup>25</sup> cessors and contemporaries, and as his knowledge referred to the past he was a 'prophet' turning backward like Hesiod, like Kallimachos, and like—Epimenides, who according to his own words (457 F 1) περί τῶν ἐσομένων οὐκ ἔμαντεύετο ἀλλὰ περί τῶν γεγονότων μὲν, ἀδῆλων δέ. That may be surprising but it is by no means incredible: the earliest Hellenistic <sup>30</sup> literature already shows a considerable number of parallel figures seeking a special legitimation for a new and surprising form of instruction by prose works which are mostly (but not solely) of a philosophic, semi-philosophic, or religious nature. The peculiar feature of A.'s work probably was that he did not present himself as a traveller, making use of a <sup>35</sup> motif which was the ordinary one in his time <sup>12)</sup>, but that he chose an old poetical-religious conception instead for a subject which we shall, after all, have to describe as historical <sup>13)</sup>. Here, it is true, doubts begin. The title 'Ατθίς is sufficiently guaranteed by the earliest witness Antigonos, and the first question is whether it must be understood, when used by A.,

in the same technical sense in which later grammarians (librarians) and modern writers use it, or whether A. by this title, suggestive of an epos, which he most probably formed himself <sup>14</sup>), simply meant a 'book about Athens', which in that case dealt with the mythic period. The fact that  
 5 the three fragments (to which we cannot add with any certainty <sup>15</sup>) all refer to the early period of the kings does not, of course, allow of a certain decision, but in my opinion not only the pretension to inspired wisdom, but also the character of A.s tradition (which will be dealt with presently) favours the view that he kept within the sphere of 'Archaeology' <sup>16</sup>), and  
 10 did not write a chronicle.

A second question, too, can only be answered by considerations of probability. It is hardly conceivable that the author should have taken seriously his conception, which he borrowed from prophetic literature: just because this conception derives from prophetic, not from poetical  
 15 literature in general, because not the Muses inspired him but the Nymphs, and because he carries the river of the underworld in his name, it does not seem impossible that the preface, where he emphasized his lack of learned training, contained a grain of Platonic irony. Such a trait would not even be uncommon: Hekataios of Abdera for instance will not have  
 20 expected his readers to take seriously his journey to the Hyperboreans, where *ναυσι δ' οὔτε πεζός ἰών ἄν εὔροις θαυματῶν ὁδόν*. Kallimachos (F 191, 10/1 Pf.), who called Euhemerios τὸν πάλαι Πάγκαιον ὁ πλάσας Ζᾶνα γέρων λαλάζων, may have had no illusions about the mystification by the Athenian author; that was no reason for rejecting his pretty stories. But Theo-  
 25 phrastos (?), Antigonos, and the authors of the works *Περὶ κλοπῆς*, even Apollodoros, seem to have taken the book seriously <sup>17</sup>); at least neither the evidence nor the quotations (which it is true have passed through many hands) suggest any suspicion as to the authenticity of the book or its author <sup>18</sup>). This would be immaterial if the stories A. narrated con-  
 30 tained genuine old Attic tradition as seems to be universally believed <sup>19</sup>), for in that case the person of the transmitter would not affect their value. But I am afraid that a close examination even of the fragments 1 and 2 (for in F 3 the arbitrary invention is manifest) will yield a different result, and one that will bring the unknown author dangerously near to what  
 35 later on put forth most singular blossoms under the name of *Ξένη ἱστορία*. In any case, already Phanodemos in his *Atthis* treated the period of the kings at an almost incredible length and (or so it seems) with partly quite free inventions, and the pseudepigraphic book of A. may well represent an intermediate station between him and the openly novelistic

Ἄττικαὶ ἱστορίαι which began at the latest with Baton (no. 268) about the middle of the third century. There may have been more books of this kind with or without a mystification on the part of the author: Bion of Prokonnesos (no. 332), the title of whose book we do not know, 5 does not seem to be a late author, while about the time of the Αὐτόχθονες of the second Pherekydes (no. 333), who professed to be an Athenian, I do not venture an opinion. These writings, taken as a whole, represent a second line of development which does not lead from the Local Chronicle towards true Historiography as the *Atthides* of Androtion and 10 Philochoros did, but away from the historical or political viewpoint towards novels and works of fiction<sup>20</sup>). Naturally these Αὐτόχθονες, Ἄττικά, Ἱστορίαι Ἄττικαί, Μοψοπίαι, or whatever their names were, not only gave up the form of the chronicle, but also confined themselves wholly or mainly to the periods from which one had no, or almost no, documen- 15 tary tradition. The general public, however, was more interested in attractive stories than in the dry chronicle of the 'dark' centuries, as for contemporary history, narrated in detail from a political standpoint as it was in the books of the Atthiographers, it preferred the brilliantly written books of a Duris, Demochares, Phylarchos.

20

## F(ragments)

(1) Apollon. *Hist. mir.* 8 Ἄνδρων ἐν τῇ δ' τῶν πρὸς Φίλιππον Θουσιῶν (360 F 1) · κορώνη ἐν τῇ Ἄττικῇ εἰς τὴν ἀκρόπολιν οὐδεμία ἐώραται εἰσερχομένη, καθάπερ οὐδὲ ἐν Πάφῳ περὶ τὰ θυρώματα τὰ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης μυῖα ἐπιπταμένη (Leopardi ἐφισταμένη P). Aelian. *N. A.* 5, 8 Ἀριστοτέλης (F 366 Rose) 25 ὄφεισιν ἐχθρὰν εἶναι τὴν Ἀστυπλαιέων γῆν λέγει, καθάπερ καὶ τὴν Ῥήνειαυταῖς γαλαῖς ὁ αὐτὸς ὁμολογεῖ ἡμῖν · κορώνη δὲ ἐς τὴν Ἀθηναίων ἀκρόπολιν οὐκ ἐπιβατὸν (ἔστιν ἐπιβατὰ He). Plin. *N. H.* 10, 30 *ipsa ales (scil. cornix) est inauspicatae garrulitatis, a quibusdam tamen laudata. ab arcturi sidere ad hirundinum adventum notatur eam in Minervae lucis templisque raro,* 30 *alicubi omnino non adspici, sicut Athenis.* Kallimach. *He kale* F 260, 17 Pf. 1) καὶ β' δτ' ἐπόφ[ . . . ] . . . . . ἐφ' ὃν ἂν τιν' ἕκαστοι / Οὐρανόαι· ἐπάγοιεν ἐμῶι πτ[ε]ρῶι, ἀλλὰ ἐ Παλλάς / τῆς μὲν ἔσω δηναιωνάφῃ δρ[ό]σον Ἡφαίστοιο / 20 με φ. οτε Κεκροπιδ . . . . επ . . . . . λ. αν / λάθριον ἄρρητον, γενετῆ δ' ὄθεν οὔτε νιν ἔγνω / οὔτ' ἐδάην, φήμη δὲ κατ' ὠκυγίους ἔφαν . υται / οἰωνούς, 35 ὡς δῆθεν ὕφ' Ἡφαίστωι τέκεν αἶα. / τουτάκι δ' ἡ μὲν ἔης ἔρυμα χθονὸς ὄφρα βάλοιτο, / 26 τὴν βα νέον ψήφωι τε Διὸς δυ[ο]καίδεκά τ' ἄλλων / ἀθανάτων ὄφιος τε κατέλλαβε μαρτυρήσιον, / Πελλήνην ἐφίκανεν Ἀχαιίδα· τόφρα δὲ

κοῦραι / αἱ φυλακοὶ κακὸν [ἔ]ργον ἐπεφράσαντο τελέσαι, / κίστης . . . .  
 . . . . . δεσμά τε ἀνείσαι. // <sup>30</sup> \* \* \* / <sup>34</sup> \* \* \* Ἀθήνης / <sup>35</sup> . . . . . μούнай  
 δὲ παραπτῦ . . . . . κορῶναι / δαίμοσιν· οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε τεόν ποτε πότνια  
 θυ[μ]ὸν / . . . . . ὅσα πολλὰ παραίσια μήποτ' ἔλαφροί / .. σομεν οἰώ-  
 5 νοί, τότε δ' ὤφελον . . . . . / οὕτως ἡμετέρην μὲν ἀπέπτυσεν, οὐδὲ  
 γενέθλην / <sup>40</sup> . . . . . ἀλλὰ πέσοιο / μηδέ ποτ' ἐκ θυ-  
 μοῖο βαρὺς χόλος αἰὲν Ἀθήνης.

That Kallimachos took the story from A. is universally agreed since Gomperz and Wellmann, and the assumption is certainly correct <sup>2</sup>). There  
 10 remain, it is true, doubts as to some details, partly in consequence of the  
 bad preservation of the opening of col. II and the first ten lines of col.  
 III, partly because the excerpt of Antigonos seems to be somewhat  
 incomplete or inaccurate, whether this is due to the negligence of the  
 narrator or to the abridgement of his text in the tradition <sup>3</sup>). In my  
 15 opinion the fact that the same three stories appear in Kallimachos in the  
 same connexion as in A. is decisive. For what A. narrates is neither  
 'genuine Attic tradition of the fifth century', nor is it 'the old legend of  
 the cult by which the union of the two divine persons (Athena and  
 Hephaistos) in the Kerameikos was celebrated'. We do not even have  
 20 here 'three myths connected among themselves' <sup>4</sup>), but evidently a  
 literary combination of three different components which still appear  
 separately in our tradition: nobody in Athens knew of a connexion until  
 A., inspired by the nymphs, wrote it down. The centre-piece is the legend  
 of the birth of Erichthonios and the disobedience of the daughters of  
 25 Kekrops, which is as old as it is self-contained; it was an aitiological  
 legend ending with the fate of the (three) sisters <sup>5</sup>). Two other aitiological  
 stories are connected with that legend, both belonging to well-known  
 types; both may in themselves be old and popular. One of them explains  
 the origin, situation, and perhaps the shape of 'beautifully formed' and  
 30 'widely visible' Lykabettos, which, a southern spur of the Turkovuni,  
 rises steeply and is separated from the Akropolis by a broad depression <sup>6</sup>).  
 The original independence of this legend is shown by the fact that  
 Lykabettos is not on the road from Athens to Pellene: the town in Achaia  
 is attested by Kallimachos, in whom neither an error would be credible  
 35 nor an arbitrary alteration for which no reason can be perceived <sup>7</sup>).  
 If Athena really came from the northern Peloponnese she went beyond  
 her goal, and the supposition seems obvious that the legend originally  
 did not mention Pellene, but Pallene, whether the Chalcidian promon-  
 tory or (more likely) the Attic Pallene was understood <sup>8</sup>), and that A.

changed the name in order to connect the aition with the Erichthonios story. It is quite possible that the legend is very old, that Athena did not come from Athens, and that she brought the rock by no means with the friendly intention (να έρυμα περι τῆς ἀκρόπολεως ποιήση. But I suppress suppositions which are not capable of proof because we know the legend merely in the form A. gave it <sup>9</sup>). In regard to the second aition this is not so. The observation that κορώνη εις τὴν ἀκρόπολιν οὐδεμία ἐώραται εἰσερχομένη occurs in our tradition independently of A. <sup>10</sup>); the fact is mentioned in connexion with similar observations in other places, usually not explained but simply stated. Among the witnesses transcribed above is Andron (or Habron) who perhaps belongs still to the fourth century, and what he says in Περι θυσιῶν may be compared with the πάτριον τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις κῶνα μὴ ἀναβαίνειν εις ἀκρόπολιν <sup>11</sup>). It is uncertain whether the experts in the πάτρια explained the facts at all; possibly they merely stated that the extraordinary appearance of the animals concerned was ominous, that it required a consultation of the *mantis* or certain sacrifices. The story A. told which, without being related to cult, gives an aition for the fact may be transferred from the Koronis-Eoee of Hesiod (F 123 Rz <sup>3</sup>) in which ἄγγελος ἦλθε κόραξ ἱερῆς ἀπὸ δαιτὸς Πυθῶ ἐς ἡγά-  
<sup>20</sup> θέν, φράσσειν δ' ἄρα ἔργ' αἰδηλα Φοῖβωι ἀκερσεχόμῃ, ὅτι Ἴσχυς ἔγημε Κόρωνιν, and I believe that A. invented the aition <sup>12</sup>) in order to establish a connexion between the legend of the daughters of Kekrops and that of Lykabettos.

(2) Nobody will doubt that Androgeos and Eurygyes are old figures  
<sup>25</sup> in Attic myth, perhaps also in Attic cult. What we have to consider is on what grounds and by what right A. identified the two. This question cannot be answered out of a preconceived opinion as to how far the Atthidographers handed down old-established tradition and (for this is an *and*, not an *or*) how far we must allow for invention and arbitrary  
<sup>30</sup> handling or (to word it more politely and perhaps more justly) for hypotheses of the Atthidographers themselves and their sources. Each particular case must be judged on its merits, and the poorer the tradition is the more accurately we have to establish it before making deductions. This self-evident rule of method has been almost throughout contravened  
<sup>35</sup> in the case of Androgeos-Eurygyes. Eurygyes is known exclusively from the article of Hesychios, whose source is unknown <sup>1</sup>). The lexicographer cites (1) A. for an ἄγων ἐπιτάφιος celebrated for Eurygyes in the Kerameikos, and for the identification of him with Androgeos <sup>2</sup>). The agon, lacking in the preserved compilations, is otherwise unknown, and the

phrasing in the abbreviated article is not quite clear: it looks as if A. dealt with Androgeos, the well-known son of Minos, for whom an agon of such a kind is attested, and regarded, for whatever reason, Eurygyes as his surname. (2) Hesiod for the name Eurygyes and (or so it 5 seems) for the fact of his coming from Athens; but again the wording of the only line is open to doubt, and we do not know the context in which it stood <sup>3</sup>). Nothing is said of Androgeos, and nothing indicates his occurrence in the same context; Toepffer *R E I* col. 2145 is plainly wrong in saying 'that Eurygyes is identical with Androgeos is shown by a 10 fragment of Hesiod', though most writers repeat the statement in one or another form <sup>4</sup>). The further conjecture that A. attested his equation by the quotation from Hesiod <sup>5</sup>) is perhaps not impossible; the wording καὶ 'Ἡσίοδος, however, does not favour this idea but suggests an instance of what occurs ever and again in these lexicographic articles, *viz.* the citing 15 of two authors one of whom is an Attidographer. Moreover, the peculiar quality of A.'s *Atthis* decidedly contradicts the conjecture: anyone who obtains his wisdom from the nymphs (perhaps in very old times) does not refer to a (relatively) late poet. Accordingly the figure of Eurygyes remains in the dark, the only light on it coming not from the name <sup>6</sup>) 20 but to a certain degree from the fact that a funeral agon was established for him <sup>7</sup>).

The tradition about Androgeos is only seemingly more abundant; actually it is confined to two data: (1) he is called the son of Minos and (2) he met his death in Attica. What we hear about him does not reach 25 back beyond the second half of the fourth century; the earliest witnesses are A. and Philochoros <sup>8</sup>), and there is a remarkable contrast between the two: according to A., who identifies Androgeos with Eurygyes (who in Hesiod seems to have been an Athenian), the ἀγῶν ἐπιτάφιος for the son of Minos takes place in Athens and in the Kerameikos; according to 30 Philochoros, who knows nothing of Eurygyes <sup>9</sup>) and who refers for Androgeos to 'the Cretans', Minos holds it in Crete and τοὺς καῖδας (*viz.* of the Athenian tribute) ἀθλα τοῖς νικῶσιν ἐδίδου τέως ἐν τῷ Λαβυρίνθωι φυλαττομένους. About the lateness and the character of this second version surely nobody will have any illusions, but we have no right to ascribe *a priori* a 35 higher age to the first: neither has any greater value at first sight than the widely divergent versions of the death of Androgeos <sup>10</sup>); there is one among these which, as a parallel to the exculpation of Minos, exculpates the Athenians <sup>11</sup>). The whole mass of stories is based on one and the same presupposition that Androgeos is the son of Minos; and again we cannot



tell *a priori* how old this presupposition is and if there is more at the bottom of it than an arbitrary connexion invented perhaps by the poet of the *Theseis* at the end of the sixth century, or by a genealogist who was specially interested in Athens (Pherekydes for choice), or even as late as 5 by a tragic poet. The suggestion of a relatively late date for this tradition (*i.e.* not before the end of the sixth century) is favoured both by the abundance of versions, part of which are manifestly invented, and by the rôle the Panathenaia, or the Marathonian bull, or the two together, play in regard to the manner of the death; and the obvious purpose of the 10 inventions is the endeavour to find a reason for the war of Minos with Athens. Actually Androgeos is just as obscure as Eurygyes. Both this fact and the inexplicable name <sup>12)</sup> support at least the opinion that the figure itself is early. Because of this very obscurity the *λόγιοι ἄνδρες* used it in the most different ways for the solution of unanswerable questions.

15 Doubtless it is a hypothesis when the Atthidographers found 'Androgeos, the son of Minos' in the hero of an altar at Phaleron which *καλεῖται Ἡρώος* <sup>13)</sup>: that means that they brought the anonymous hero into the story of Theseus' expedition to Crete and thus explained him. It is another hypothesis when Kallimachos in the *Aitia* (or rather his Atthidographic 20 source) declared the *κατὰ πρύμναν ἥρωος*, whose worship at Phaleron Clement's well-informed source attests <sup>14)</sup>, to be Androgeos <sup>15)</sup>. A third hypothesis, attested late and (unless it is a mere autoschediasm) perhaps dating only from Hellenistic times, makes Androgeos' death the aition for the use of *φαρμακοί* at the Thargelia <sup>16)</sup>. Small wonder that the hypo- 25 theses partly cancel each other: the first two at the least are hardly compatible, either factually or locally, with the stories about the death which point to the city, to Marathon, to the realm of Pallas; nor do they agree with the identification of Eurygyes and Androgeos which would take the latter to the Kerameikos <sup>17)</sup>. The whole tradition, which starts 30 from the death of Androgeos, is a weak foundation (if a foundation at all) for the attempts at determining the nature of this vague figure, which some take to be Attic <sup>18)</sup> (and as far as the tradition goes there is some probability in this supposition), some to be Cretan <sup>19)</sup>. But it is not our business to deal with these problems; we have only to do with the historical 35 (mythographic) tradition, and from this standpoint neither the character of these stories nor a comparison with F 1 and F 3 makes the supposition acceptable that solely what A. 'recorded about the son of Minos may claim to be authentic and old' <sup>20)</sup>. It seems almost inevitable to me that we must draw the converse inference: A., by identifying the obscure

Eurygyes, who had almost entirely disappeared from the tradition, with the much-discussed son of Minos, tried to solve a problem in the very same manner as others who attempted to provide a personality for the Ἡρώς or the κατὰ πρόμναν Ἡρώς by bringing him into Mythical History.

- 5 Thus incidentally the second question is answered which F 2 puts to us, a question not concerned with the author A. but with the cult of Athens: A. invented the ἐπ' Εὐρυγύη ἀγών, for which the source of Hesychios cites him, as little as he did the figure of Glaukos in F 3 or the miracle of the crow in F 1. How indeed could he have expected to be  
 10 believed if he invented not the explanation only but the fact to be explained as well? At about 300 B.C. we are still far from the times of Ptolemaios Chennos and Ps. Plutarch when even that was possible. A. only released that agon from its isolation by bringing an old ceremony of unknown origin (and which may have been as obsolete in his time as  
 15 e.g. the Buphonia were) into the context of the Theseus story and the complex of expiatory actions by which Athens tried to appease the wrath of the gods and of Minos<sup>21</sup>). That seems to me to be almost obvious. What we should like to know (but do not) are two things of relatively minor importance, though not unimportant altogether: (1) did A.  
 20 already know 'the Cretans' i.e. the book about Crete to which Philochoros (F 17) referred for an ἀγών ἐπιτάφιος in Crete in honour of Androgeos? If he did such a book would have facilitated his invention. For an invention it was: the fact should at least be noticed that not one of the many stories, some of which were detailed, knows of this consequence of  
 25 Androgeos' death that an expiatory ἀγών ἐπιτάφιος was established for him in Athens<sup>22</sup>). (2) Does the localization of the ἐπ' Εὐρυγύη ἀγών in the Kerameikos furnish a true fact? To put the question differently: did the ceremony still exist at the time of A., or did he breathe life into a ceremony of which only the tradition survived (if it was a ceremony, not a  
 30 phrase no longer understood, or even a proverb) by giving it not only an aition but a place as well out of his inspired wisdom? And if the latter is the case, was it his intention to give a respectable pre-history to the agon which was part of the funeral ceremony established by the State as late as 464 B.C.<sup>23</sup>) for their fallen in war? The Panathenaia<sup>24</sup>), like all the  
 35 great funeral agones of Greece, had at some earlier time been given such a pre-history.

(3) Hygin. *Astr.* 2, 14 p. 51, 16 Bu *Aesculapius . . . novissime fertur Hippolytum . . . sanasse, ita uti Eratosthenes dicit. nonnulli Glaucum Minoos filium eius opera revixisse dixerunt, pro quo (ut peccato) Jovem*

domum eius fulmine incendisse, ipsum autem propter artificium et Apollinem eius patrem inter sidera anguem tenentem constituisse, ut quidam dixerunt <sup>1</sup>). Hac de causa anguem dicitur tenere, quod cum Glaucum cogere-  
 retur sanare, conclusus quodam loco secreto, bacillum tenens manu cum quid  
 5 ageret cogitaret, dicitur anguis ad bacillum eius adrepsisse, quem Aescu-  
 lapius . . . . interfecit . . . postea fertur alter anguis eodem venisse, ore ferens  
 herbam, et in caput eius imposuisse, quo facto utrosque loco fugisse; quare  
 Aesculapium usum eadem herba et Glaucum revixisse. itaque anguis et in  
 Aesculapii tutela et in astris dicitur collocatus, qua consuetudine ducti pos-  
 10 teri eius tradiderunt reliquis, ut medici anguibus uterentur <sup>2</sup>).

The narrative of A. was used by a Hellenistic author who enlarged it by adding at least the *καταστερισμός*. The importance of the story for the general conception of A. can hardly be overestimated. The story of  
 15 Glaukos the Cretan who awoke from an accidental death by the use of a  
 miraculous herb is a myth or a folk-tale of considerable antiquity and  
 of great popularity in the fifth century B.C. and later <sup>3</sup>). His saviour is  
 always Polyidos, a seer from Argos. If A. mentions in his stead Asklepios,  
 whose list of restorations to life grows before our very eyes, the arbitrary  
 invention is manifest. This does not help us to determine the time of A. <sup>4</sup>),  
 20 but the fact itself cannot be doubted, and it ought to settle once and for  
 all the prejudice as to the antiquity and the special authenticity of  
 stories told by him. Modern historians of religion again and again succumb  
 to the temptation of regarding the uniqueness of a piece of information  
 as sufficient proof of its antiquity, and they go on to build on the sup-  
 25 posedly ancient fact. Actually the uniqueness very often is an indication  
 of late invention. In the present case no writer has ventured to build on  
 this story; they preferred to keep silent about this manifest example of  
 a late invention. In what context A. placed his miracle of Asklepios we  
 do not know. I am not aware of any connexion between Glaukos and  
 30 Athens, but Phaidra is his sister, and our sources mention his case beside  
 that of Hippolytos. Consequently we may doubt whether A. gave a  
 detailed account of Minos, not strictly confining himself to stories con-  
 cerning Athens, or whether he mentioned other miraculous healings of  
 Asklepios in the context of the Hippolytos legend. Personally I believe  
 35 that the dithyrambic poets Kinesias and Telestes, who on their part seem  
 to have had a predecessor in the author of the *Ναυπάκτια ἔπη*, inspired the  
 invention.

## 331-333. HEGESINUS. BION. PHEREKYDES-ANTIOCHOS

These three or four shadowy figures here follow Amelesagoras not because the poem of Hegesinus is also quoted as *Atthis*, but because the singular book of Amelesagoras throws a certain light on them. As far as the books quoted under their names really existed (which is very doubtful in regard to Hegesinus and Pherekydes) they seem to have restricted themselves like that of Amelesagoras to the 'Archaeology', though in view of the scanty evidence it cannot be decided how far they gave a continuous account following the series of kings, or whether they dated by kings if they supplied only single stories. Nor do we know whether for the period of the kings they started from the genuine *Atthises*, and how far they claimed to be taken seriously. For us they are all equally suspect, if in different ways; they do not belong to history and science but (apart from the underlying mystification as to the authors' names and the titles of the books) to the sphere of light reading. They all pretend to belong to the earliest times, or they are quoted as very old authorities in the real books of a certain species; they themselves or those who use them lay claim to a peculiar wisdom or to special documentary evidence. We may group together Hegesinus and Pherekydes because they probably owe their existence merely to forged quotations by later authors of whom Antiochos cannot be dated, while Kallippos probably belongs to the period of the emperors. Bion, who is not late, and Antiochos are real writers who for their subject-matter refer to invented earlier authors—Antiochos to one Pherekydes who competes with Musaios as a compiler of the poems of Orpheus, Bion to 'the old Kadmos' and perhaps to others. But we had better discuss these questions under the single authors.

## 331. HEGESINUS

## INTRODUCTION

Atenstaedt *Herm.* 57, 1922, p. 228 ff. assigned the only quotation (together with Pausan. 9, 38, 9-10) to the rather problematic commentary on Corinna by Alexander Polyhistor (273 F 97). I am altogether suspicious of the almost generally accepted supposition that Pausanias used Polyhistor frequently <sup>1)</sup>, and I keep to the opinion that Kallippos, who is quoted in both passages, belongs among the not quite small number of mostly late authors whom Pausanias actually read himself <sup>2)</sup>. The συγ-

γραφή or λόγος ἔχων ἐς Ὀρχομενίους (whatever its form) was one of many local writings of a rhetorical and panegyric character which enjoyed an increasing popularity during the period of the emperors. Their historical value and reliability are generally poor in comparison with the Hellenistic local histories and periegesis of the *περί*-type. I have no doubt that Carl Robert <sup>3)</sup> was correct in stating that everything Pausanias says about Orchomenos was taken from that book, and also in recognizing as forgeries the two epic quotations for which the periegete professes himself indebted to it. The very formula by which he introduces the quotations and which is the same for both <sup>4)</sup> arouses our suspicion; their contents and what we know otherwise about the poets tend to confirm it. Chersias of Orchomenos, to whom 'the Orchomenians' assign the epigram on the tomb of Hesiod <sup>5)</sup>, is otherwise known only to the Boeotian Plutarch who supplies some detailed information about the poet's life <sup>6)</sup>, taken perhaps from the same Kallippos who might then be dated in the second half of the first century A.D. As to the *Althis* of H., Kallippos is the only person to know anything about it; quite apart from the contents of the quotation, we may confidently maintain that this evidence is not sufficient for making us believe in a sixth century epic poem on Athens: of early Attic poems we only know the *Theseis*, everything else is imaginary. It is therefore to little purpose to ask whether Kallippos invented the name 'Ἠγησίβουος after the Ἠγησίβουος of the *Kypria*, though it may be stated that small alterations like this in names that have come down by tradition are typical for forgers of the stamp of Ptolemaios Chennos and Ps. Plutarch <sup>7)</sup>.

## F

(1) The fact that the statements are unique is not surprising, nor does it prove their antiquity <sup>1)</sup>. It belongs to the style of these sensational books that they eliminate the contrast between the wild giants of the mountains, the *fratres tendentes opaco Pelion imposuisse Olympo* <sup>2)</sup>, and the *Pierides almae*, the former thus becoming the founders of the cult of the Muses. It is not worth while to go into the details of the history of this cult as excerpted by Pausanias: by its inventions it welds together all existing traditions into one uniform compilation, and its author probably was proud of having so much greater and better knowledge of the Μοῦσαι 'Ἐλικωνιάδες than Hesiod. *Th.* 53 ff. had. Incidentally Askra obtains an eponymous heroine and, by being united according to a frequent type of

Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.)

legend with the god to whom the source on the summit of the mountain belongs, a founder as well. Part of the components of the compilation may, of course, derive from Hellenistic Βοιωτικά<sup>3</sup>), and the Oioklos of H. is possibly even an old figure, since his connexion with the Aloades 5 (who are arbitrarily brought to Helikon) remains obscure. But Oioklos becomes a son of Poseidon by this connexion only, and if really 'his fame consists in his sheep', the late author probably thought of the sheep of Hesiod<sup>4</sup>).

### 332. BION OF PROKONNESOS

10

#### INTRODUCTION

B. is an elusive figure<sup>1</sup>). Now that the lexicon of Photios has provided us with a second quotation referring to Athens we shall assume with greater confidence that Plutarch meant the Prokonnesian Bion. But even now the evidence does not establish the existence of an *Atthis*, if only 15 the kind credible for Amelesagoras, *viz.* a collection of stories about early Athens<sup>2</sup>): the catalogue of homonyms (T 1; the source is Demetrios of Magnesia) merely knows 'two books written in Ionic dialect', and though Diogenes does not give it a title we cannot very well doubt that he means the work mentioned in the literature Περὶ κλοπῆς (T 3) as a paraphrase and 20 epitome 'of the old Kadmos' who was said to be μικρῶι νεώτερος Ὀρφέως (489 F 1 b), a contemporary of Pseudo-Pherekydes (333 T 1). Evidently this was said in the prooimion, and we may well ask whether the old Milesian writer owes his existence merely to the alleged epitome by B. It is further at least possible that B. mentioned Pherekydes, too, in his pre- 25 face as Pherekydes of Syros<sup>3</sup>), whom Andron of Ephesos in the early fourth century B.C. had placed before Homer<sup>4</sup>). If he did it might explain the synchronism in Diogenes (T 1) and B.s place in the earlier group of the ἀρχαῖοι συγγραφεῖς in Dionysios (T 2) as well. One might even be tempted to infer that B. dedicated his book to Pherekydes. This 30 would be a clever forger's trick: for even if B. (supposing he wrote later than Eratosthenes) thus put himself at variance with the fact established by serious research that the *Pentemychos* was the first prose book, he nevertheless secured for his own composition a high antiquity, not however so high as to be incredible at first sight to scholars who did not 35 believe in the book of the 'old Kadmos'. It should perhaps be noticed in this connexion that the 'younger Kadmos' (no. 335) wrote Ἄρτυλαι Ἰστορίαι,

or rather that the author of this book on Athens called himself Kadmos. This reasoning is uncertain enough, and all these conjectures are valid only under the assumption that the book of B. *was* a mystification. But such it was if it pretended to be an epitome of Kadmos, whose genuineness was already doubted by the ancients <sup>6</sup>). That the doubt was extended to the epitome may be inferred from φέρεται in T 1 <sup>6</sup>), and this seems a logical consequence, even if it does not mean that one also doubted the existence of the epitomator.

The time of the mystification cannot be determined with certainty. The alleged use B. made of Amelesagoras (he did not, however, quote him) does not help as we are not in a position to decide whether actually B. used Amelesagoras (as the source of Clement contends), or whether conversely B. belongs to the sources of Amelesagoras—supposing that a relation between the two mystifications existed at all <sup>7</sup>). If we assume the second alternative as being the more likely, B. would have to be dated in the last third of the fourth century at the latest <sup>8</sup>). I am not inclined to date him much earlier: these mystifications have an infectious tendency; we are able to distinguish periods when they abound. The quotation in Plutarch (F 2) neither contradicts nor corroborates the assumption: it does not occur in the nest of quotations about Theseus' expedition to the Pontos which enumerates the opinions of early authors, *i.e.* of Philochoros (the latest among them) on the one hand, the πλείους from Pherekydes down to Herodoros on the other; it occurs in a sort of appendix which cites B. (without an ethnikon and without mentioning the title of his book) and after him a Μενεκράτης τις ιστορίαν περὶ Νικαίας τῆς ἐν Βιθυνίαι πόλεως ἐκδεδωκώς (no. 701), who cannot be determined chronologically but probably is late and used directly by Plutarch. It is not impossible that Plutarch obtained the name of B. from Menekrates, and that the latter developed the story which, in the brief rendering by Plutarch, has no real conclusion. In any case it is remarkable that the conduct of Theseus does not answer to the character of the hero as it is usually described, and Menekrates may have made use of B.'s assertion with motives which distantly remind us of the ξένη ιστορία. To conclude this unsatisfactory discussion with a further uncertainty: is Bion the real name of the author, or was he more clever than Amelesagoras in that he chose a commonplace name? And did he cite Prokonnesos as his home in remembrance of Aristeas?

## F

(1) Comparing Hesych. s.v. Ἄγραυλος·θυγάτηρ Κέκροπος·παρὰ δὲ Ἀττικοῖς καὶ ἑμνύουσιν κατ' αὐτῆς· ἦν δὲ ἱέρεια τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς, who derives from Atthidographic tradition <sup>1)</sup>, we may infer that B. was quoted for one of the many versions about the daughters of Kekrops. Perhaps the statement εἰς τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῆς Κέκροπος τιμὴν solved the problem as to how the offender against the prohibition of Athena could enjoy worship, and then there might be a connexion with the story told by Amelesagoras (330 F 1) of whom B. is said to have made use (T 3). But the excerpt is so scanty that we cannot speak with any confidence.

(2) It must have had a sensational effect at least on Athenian readers that the Ἀμαζόνων στρατὸς συγάνωρ (Aischyl. *Prom.* 723) consisted not of ἀνδροκτόνοι, as Herodotos (4, 110, 1) explains their name <sup>2)</sup>, but of φύσει φίλανδροι. But the same Herodotos, in the history of the origin of the Sauromatai (4, 113, 1), also tells us that καὶ τις μουνωθεισέων τινι αὐτέων ἐνεχρίμπετο, καὶ ἡ Ἀμαζῶν οὐκ ἀπωθέετο ἀλλὰ περειδεῖ χρῆσασθαι, and there were other stories as well which allowed of another conception. The rape of the Amazon as told by B. reminds us strongly of the rape of Io as told by Herodotos (1, 1); this Theseus is rather different from the hero whom Tragedy and Atthidography had more and more ethicised and idealized; it is more like that of the Phoenician tradespeople.

(3) The spring of Silenos may have been mentioned anywhere; but among the bearers of the name B. known to us the Prokonnesian (to whom Schweighaeuser assigned the fragment) is still the most likely choice. Schefold *A. M.* 59, 1934, p. 142 f., when interpreting an Attic *pelike*, thinks of B.'s version.

## 333. ANTIOCHOS-PHEREKYDES OF ATHENS

## INTRODUCTION

The dating πρεσβύτερος τοῦ Συρίου (the θεολόγος and first prose writer whose contemporary Bion is said to have been) receives a more accurate determination by the following relative clause δὲν λόγος τὰ Ὀρφείως συναγαγεῖν. This certainly means that the author of the *Αὐτόχθονες* <sup>1)</sup> lived and wrote in the early period of the kings as an approximate contemporary of Eumolpos who, according to an Athenian tradition, τὰς τοῦ πατρὸς Μουσαίου ποιήσεις ἐξέθηκεν <sup>2)</sup> and of Musaios who ὀλίγα ἐπανορθώσας



κατέγραψεν <sup>3</sup>) the hymns of Orpheus. There can be no reasonable doubt that this author (as at the latest perceived by Porphyrios) is fictitious, and that the *Αὐτόχθονες* in ten books are invented after the ten books of *Γενεαλογίαι* written by the Athenian Pherekydes during the first quarter  
5 of the fifth century B.C. <sup>4</sup>). What remains doubtful is whether the author introduced himself in his preface, or whether the writers using, or pretending to use, the very old book about Attic 'Archaeology' characterised him as a disciple of Orpheus and, by attributing to him another work (the epic *Παραινέσεις* <sup>5</sup>), bestowed on him a more solid individual-  
10 ity. In other words: did the *Αὐτόχθονες* exist at all <sup>6</sup>) as a pseudepigraphon in the style of Amelesagoras, Ps. Akusilaos, Dares and Diktys, and if so, did the forger take from the Athenian genealogist more than merely the name, did he, on the basis of his allegedly contemporary knowledge of the 'Archaeology' publish what we might call an 'improved edition' of the  
15 *Γενεαλογίαι* <sup>7</sup>)? Or is this Pherekydes nothing but an invented authority like (as I am inclined to believe) the Kadmos of Bion, the poetical *Atthis* of Hegesinus, and the innumerable authorities invented by Ptolemaios Chennos? The first alternative might be favoured by the fact that both the otherwise unknown Antiochos and Ph. are quoted each once  
20 without the other by Clement and in the *Etymologicum*, and that it is these quotations which furnish the titles *Ἱστορίαι* and *Αὐτόχθονες*. The second alternative is favoured, decisively in my opinion, by the quotations of both together in the scholia on Aristeides as Φ. καὶ Ἀντίοχος (F 4) and, more illuminating, as Φ. καὶ μετ' αὐτὸν Ἀντίοχος (F 3). Again there  
25 can be no reasonable doubt that Antiochos quoted Ph. as his authority, and again we meet with the alternative whether we have to regard at least A. as a real author, or whether both authors, A. as well as Ph., originated in the fertile brain of (let us say) Ptolemaios Chennos who e.g. for the obviously invented story of a beauty competition between Thetis  
30 and Medeia cites an Ἀθηνόδωρος ὁ Ἐρετριεύς ἐν ἡ Ὑπομνημάτων, stating that this author on his part adduced Ἀντίοχον ἐν β τῶν Κατὰ πόλιν μυθικῶν (no. 29)? If this (rather uncertain) hypothesis were correct it would date the fiction, for Ptolemaios did not write before the last quarter of the first century A.D. The fragments do not contradict this date as to their  
35 contents, and possibly even Plutarch (F 5) owes his Φερεκίδης ὁ παλαιός to Ptolemaios <sup>8</sup>). Perhaps it would have been better if I had printed the whole text of this author in brevier.

## F

(1) The variants of the author's name ('Αντίμαχος, 'Αντίλοχος) in the excerpts of Clement are of no consequence. I could not make up my mind to accept into the text the additional words in Theodoretos, which  
 5 are generally treated as part of the tradition, though at first sight the fuller determination of the place by *παρὰ τὴν Πολιοῦχον αὐτὴν* appears welcome when compared with the preceding statement about Akrisios. But apart from the fact that this statement is in confusion (see below), it is not at all certain that it belongs to A.: Clement in his catalogue of  
 10 graves in sacred places does not quote an author for each item, and a number of them referring to Athens follow without such evidence <sup>1</sup>). We must not assign them simply to A.; it is even more probable that the brief citation concerning Kekrops was added by Clement himself in the enumeration of his main source which mentioned on the Akropolis only  
 15 the grave of Erichthonios. A. is the first, and for us the only, witness that the Kekropion of the inscriptions was regarded as the tomb of Kekrops, a view gladly accepted by Christian controversialists <sup>2</sup>). This evidence is late <sup>3</sup>), if not altogether invented, though perhaps on the basis of Hellenikos' list of Athenian kings and Philochoros' (328 F 93) explanation of  
 20 the epithet *διφυής*. In any case, the 'tomb' (if such it is) does not yield anything for the true nature of Kekrops, nor does the fact that in Aristoph. *Vesp.* 438 he is addressed as *ὦ Κέκροψ ἥρωας ἀναξ τὰ πρὸς ποδῶν Δρακοντίδη*. Still less is anything proved by his being one of the heroes of the ten phylai who are officially called *ἐπώνυμοι* because they were se-  
 25 lected as such from a far greater number of *ἀρχηγέται*, not all of them being heroes in the religious sense of the word <sup>4</sup>). As to the grave of Akrisios, whose name some recent scholars regard as Illyrian, the tradition is less simple. According to the genuine Pherekydes (3 F 12) he died in Larissa (Pelasgiotis), *καὶ αὐτὸν κατατίθεται Περσεύς [καὶ οἱ Λαρισσαῖοι]* <sup>5</sup>) *πρὸσθεν τῆς*  
 30 *πόλεως, καὶ αὐτοῦ ποιοῦσιν ἥρωιον οἱ ἐπιχώριοι*; the strained manner in which he substantiates his statement shows that either the *ἥρωιον* or the tomb was a given fact for him, and that he had to find a reason for the king of Argos being buried in Thessaly. Others shifted the story he told to Seriphos <sup>6</sup>), thus cutting the knot. From all this one may infer that  
 35 there was no tomb of Akrisios in Argos at all. The triple localization in Clement (*ἐν ταῖς νεαῖς τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἐν Λαρίσσι ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει*) combines incompatible data: *ἐν Λαρίσσι* (without an article) points to the Thessalian town, the temple of Athena <sup>7</sup>) and the Akropolis point to Argos, and at

least the second datum seems impossible for Larissa because the tomb there is not ἐν ἀκροπόλει but πρόσθεν τῆς πόλεως; also the ἡρῶιον cannot be placed in the temple of Athena. Consequently Clement fused two versions; if he found the Argive tomb in A. (which is uncertain and not very probable), it may be one of A.s inventions.

(2) The quotation from the *Ἀυτόχθονες*<sup>1)</sup> is obviously taken from another source and appended to the aitiological legend which was taken from an author *Περὶ μνηῶν (καὶ ἑορτῶν)* and before that occurred in the *Atthides*<sup>2)</sup>. The difference is manifest: Ph. is not explaining an Attic festival, he is speculating about the origin of language. The grammatical subject must be Apollo<sup>3)</sup>, and the invention by the Greek god is well in accordance with the tendency of F 3. But how the writer managed to derive the 'invention' of language from *Βοηδρομιος* or *βοηδρομεῖν* I do not see, even if he found in *βοή* the primary stage of inarticulate sounds<sup>4)</sup>.

(3) The tendency is obvious in this fragment and, to some extent, already recognized by Gutschmid<sup>1)</sup>. The author contradicts the prevailing and orientalizing theology: as language was invented not by the Egyptian Hermes but by the Greek god Apollo (F 2), thus Dionysos is not Osiris and does not come from Egypt or from a Nysa, Arabian, Indian or wherever situated, but (like Isis) his name proves him to be Greek<sup>2)</sup>. It was the 'Attic autochthones' who introduced the gods to Egypt (no doubt therefore the Ph. of F 3 is the author of the *Ἀυτόχθονες* of F 2); they also established the mysteries, and they founded the (oldest) Egyptian town Thebes. Quite apart from the kind of etymology and the connexion with a 'physical' explanation, these assertions differ from the fourth century controversy about the relations between Athens and Sais<sup>3)</sup> (showing at the same time their late origin) in two points: (1) Ph. is no more dealing with the special question unimportant in itself concerning Athens and Sais, but with the fundamental one concerning Hellas and Egypt in the religious aspect; (2) his 'Attic' autochthones are called Ogygos and Thebe, *i.e.* at least one of them bears a Boeotian name<sup>4)</sup>. Evidently the difference between Attica and Boeotia is immaterial to this Ph.: Thebes and Athens are both Greek towns, and that was all that seemed important to him.

(4) The sequence *Φερεκύδης καὶ Ἀντίοχος* indicates that the latter cited the former, and the quotation *Φερεκύδης καὶ μετ' ἐκείνων Ἀντίοχος* in F 3 corroborates the inference<sup>1)</sup>. The question whether the second quotation of Pherekydes alone refers to the fifth century Athenian genealogist must be put, but merely in order to answer it in the negative: the foolish

etymology is meant to support the divine origin of the Palladia contested by some Hellenistic scholars <sup>2)</sup>, and the form *πάλλειν γὰρ τὸ βάλλειν* [ἐλεγον (without a subject) again corresponds to *ύσας γὰρ ἐκάλουν τὰ δένδρα* in F 3. To deal exhaustively with the tradition about the Palladia would be to no purpose here; but it may be noticed that Ptolemaios Chennos also discussed the questions concerning them, even if we cannot tell whether A.-Ph. have any connexion with him <sup>3)</sup>. The quotation from the forged book follows the genuine Attic legend <sup>4)</sup> as the explanation of Boedromion in F 2 does, and what the forger says may have differed from the account in the *Atthides* as widely as in that instance. That it actually did is shown by the appearance of the autochthon Alalkomenos. Unfortunately the text is so corrupt that a sure restoration seems impossible, but *γεφυρῶν* proves at least that it dealt with Athens <sup>5)</sup>; this is confirmed by the fuller discussion in Serv. Dan. Verg. *A.* 2, 166 <sup>6)</sup>, which is somehow connected with A.-Ph. (or his source): *dicunt sane alii unum simulacrum caelo lapsum, quod nubibus advectum (Dan adfectum C), et in ponte depositum, apud Athenas tantum fuisse, unde et Γεφυρῖτις (-ιτης Dan -ιστης C) dicta est (ex qua etiam causa pontifices nuncupatos volunt . . .). alii duo volunt: hoc de quo diximus et illud Atheniense.* The Athenian features appear even more distinctly in Joannes Lydus (see below). It follows from this evidence that Alalkomenos <sup>7)</sup> was an 'Attic autochthon' for A.-Ph. as Ogygos and Thebe were in F 2. Alterations of the text or attempts at restoring it by means of removing either the autochthon or his name <sup>8)</sup> are wrong on principle. On the contrary the very name, pointing again to Boeotia, shows how the forger (or his predecessors) worked: it is, of course, of no consequence that the genuine Pherekydes mentions among the sons of Niobe one Alalkomeneus who is nothing but the eponymous hero of the Boeotian town <sup>9)</sup>; but the history of the foundation of this town as supplied by Pausanias 9, 33, 5 (from uncertain but not quite late sources <sup>10)</sup>) is important: *γενέσθαι δὲ αὐτῆι τὸ ὄνομα <οί> μὲν ἀπὸ Ἀλαλκομενέως ἀνδρὸς αὐτόχθονος (ὑπὸ τούτου δὲ Ἀθηνᾶν τραφῆναι λέγουσιν), οἱ δὲ εἶναι καὶ τὴν Ἀλαλκομενίαν τῶν Ὠγύγου θυγατέρων φασίν* <sup>11)</sup>. I am making a distinction between A.-Ph. and his possible predecessors because (apart from Servius) there exists some further information about Alalkomeneus and the 'Palladion of the bridge', regarding which we cannot state 'positively whether it derives from A.-Ph. (or Ptolemaios Chennos) or from an earlier writer. Perhaps we may even have to distinguish two groups of statements, one of which points to Athens generally (or to the Akropolis), the other being concerned with the bridge <sup>12)</sup>. To the former group belongs the excerpt

in Steph. Byz. s.v. 'Αλαλκομένιον (where unfortunately the name of the author has dropped out of our text <sup>13</sup>) which gives us the genealogical and material connexion between Alalkomenai and Athens, but (it should be noticed incidentally) does not mention the Palladion; «ἐκ τοῦ 'Αλαλκομενέως δὲ καὶ 'Αθηναίδος τῆς 'Ιπποβότου Γλαύκωπος, ἀφ' οὗ τὸ Γλαυκώπιον καὶ Γλαυκῶπις καὶ Ζεὺς Πολιεὺς καὶ 'Αθηναῖα Πολιάς». To the second group, which is nearer to Servius and A.-Ph., belongs Ioannes Lydus *De mens.* 4, 15 <sup>14</sup>): «τι ποντίφικες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς παρὰ 'Ρωμαίους ἐλέγοντο, καθάπερ ἐν 'Αθήναις τὸ πάλαι γεφυραῖοι πάντες οἱ περὶ τὰ πάτρια ἱερά ἐξηγγηταὶ καὶ ἀρχιερεῖς, διοικηταὶ τῶν ὄλων, ἀνομάζοντο διὰ τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς γεφύρας τοῦ Σπερχεῖοῦ ποταμοῦ ἱερατεύειν τῷ Παλλάδιῳ· πόντην γὰρ οἱ 'Ρωμαῖοι τὴν γέφυραν καλοῦσι καὶ ποντίλια τὰ γεφυραῖα ξύλα, ἔθεν καὶ πραξιεργίαι δαί (Πρα-Wil) δῆθεν ἐκαλοῦντο ὡσανεὶ τελεσταί· τοῦτο γὰρ σημαίνει τὸ πόντιφεξ ἀπὸ τοῦ δυνατοῦ ἐν ἔργοις. The compilation shows why the Homeric 'Αλαλκομενηὶς 'Αθηναῖα <sup>15</sup>) is replaced in Athens by the Γεφυρῦτις of the Scholia on Vergil. We know her otherwise neither in Athens nor elsewhere, and the basis seems to me to be too unsafe for accepting as a fact 'an image or a cult of Athena Gephyritis at some unknown place but, of course, at a bridge' <sup>16</sup>). Surely what Lydus says is obviously invented in the same way as the Roman, and part of the Greek, stories in Ps. Plutarch's *Parallela*: starting from the *pontifices*, who have the bridge and the *facere* in their name, the author invented a similar board for early Athens (ἐν 'Αθήναις τὸ πάλαι) which, corresponding with the two components of the Latin word, is first called γεφυραῖοι and later πραξιεργίαι. It is quite credible that, when inventing the board, he had in mind the names of Athenian clans, and that they served him as a proof for the existence of Athenian *pontifices*; but for him the words have ceased to denote clans, they merely furnish the two names for the board. Neither clan (as far as we know) has anything to do with a cult at a bridge; but there do exist faint vestiges in later times which connect them with the, or a, Palladion, being that of the Akropolis. These facts again may have furnished evidence for the new theory; in any case they belong among the components of which it was built up. The Praxiargidai have to look after 'the old wooden image of Athena Polias', and play a prominent part in the Plynteria and Kallynteria <sup>17</sup>); the evidence speaks of 'Αθηναῖα, ἔδος etc., the Epebe inscriptions also of Pallas <sup>18</sup>), but never of the Παλλάδιον. On the other hand, Pausan. 1, 26, 6 hands down a piece of evidence which in this form seems to be really late, invented (or rather transferred from the Trojan Palladion) for the sake of the possibility of identifying Πολιάς and Παλλάδιον: τὸ δὲ ἀγνώτατον ἐν

- κοινῶι πολλοῖς πρότερον νομισθὲν ἔτεσιν <ῆ> συνῆλθον ἀπὸ τῶν δῆμων ἐστὶν Ἀθηναῖς ἀγάλμα ἐν τῇ νῦν ἀκροπόλει, τότε δὲ ὀνομαζομένη πόλει· φήμη δὲ ἐς αὐτὸ ἔχει πεσεῖν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ· καὶ τοῦτο μὲν οὐκ ἐπέξειμι εἴτε οὕτως εἴτε ἄλλως ἔχει. We shall have to infer from these facts that even γεφυραῖοι is not simply a translation of *pontifices*, but that the ultimate source of Lydus here brought in the clan of the Γεφυραῖοι; and that conjecture even seems to obtain a kind of corroboration from the inscription *Agora I 2044* (published by Meritt *Hesperia* 9, 1940, p. 86) which proves relations of the clan of the Gephyraeans to the Ζεὺς ἐμ Παλλαδίῳ. The inscription dates from 37/6 B.C., and that is the period in which we look for the starting-point of A.-Ph.s wisdom. The connexion is more slender than that of the Praxiergidai with the cult of Athena, and altogether we are far from being able to disentangle the whole maze of these late stories. They are mostly valueless in themselves, but they are of some interest as the offshoots of genuine collective research-work done down to the first century B.C.
- (5) See *Introductio*. n. 8.

### 334. ISTROS THE CALLIMACHEAN <sup>1)</sup>

#### INTRODUCTION

- The *Vita* is to all appearance wholly taken from the special book of Hermippos of Berytos <sup>2)</sup>. The long list of books at the end of it has been omitted (a frequent happening), and the opening is confused, perhaps because two or even more *Vitae* of homonymous authors were fused together <sup>3)</sup>. From Steph. Byz. s.v. Κάλλατις we know another I., who wrote *Περὶ τραγωιδίας καλῶν βιβλίων* <sup>4)</sup>; his date cannot be determined, and it is improbable to assign to him either the *Vita* of Sophokles (F 33-38) or the *Μελοποιοί* (F 56): these two books are simply quoted as Ἴστρος (in the *Vita* of Sophokles beside well-known biographers), and *μελοποιοί* are not tragic poets. As for the identification of I. of Kallatis with the Callimachean <sup>5)</sup>, that is certainly wrong: Polemon's joke (T 6) does not, of course, mean that the latter was born at the river of that name, and moreover Kallatis is not situated on the Istros. There are no sufficient reasons for rejecting the statements of Hermippos <sup>6)</sup> according to which I. came from Paphos and was originally a slave (of Kallimachos ?). That he belonged to the circle of Kallimachos is corroborated by the nature of his literary activity, by the distinctive epithet ὁ Καλλιμάχειος <sup>7)</sup>, and by the seeming variants about his native place, *viz.* Κυρηναῖος and

'Αλεξανδρεὺς<sup>8)</sup>, which are simply the home town and the residence of his (master and) teacher. Thus his activity may be assigned rather roughly to the second third of the third century B.C. which suits his relation with Kallimachos, his own criticism of Timaios (T 2), and 5 Polemon's severe criticism of him (T 6)<sup>9)</sup>.

In the Suda and in Athenaios I. is described as συγγραφεὺς<sup>10)</sup>, not as γραμματικὸς like Kallimachos himself; this is because the contents of his writings were largely historical in the wider sense of the word. We should call him an antiquary, but the Greeks had no proper term for that group 10 of scholars: the 'periegetes' Polemon, too, is called ἱστορικὸς in the Suda. It is conceivable that I. deliberately supplemented Kallimachos in this sphere as Hermippos did in the domain of biography and Philostephanos<sup>11)</sup> in that of geography. But actually there is no doubt in regard to any of the three that they were grammarians in the Callimachean 15 sense, and that they mainly moved in the tracks indicated by their master: they collected material from the 'classical' literature, which was made easily and completely accessible through the Library and had been amply catalogued by Kallimachos himself; they grouped this material together and gathered information on a great variety of special subjects, 20 as again Kallimachos himself had done in his Μετονομασίαι, Βαρβαρικά νόμματα, Κτίσεις, Περὶ ἀγώνων and the like. Even if we do not take into account such typically miscellaneous books as Ἀτακτα, Σύμμικτα, Ὑπομνήματα<sup>12)</sup>, works like the Ἀποικίαι Αἰγυπτίων, the Συναγωγή τῶν Κρητικῶν θυσίων, the Ἐπιφάνειαι<sup>13)</sup> show their character as compilations by their very titles, 25 and we may assume that I.'s three greater 'historical' books — Ἀττικά, Ἀργολικά, Ἠλειακά, were of a similar type<sup>14)</sup>. The assumption can be proved only for the first for which we have the evidence of the Scholiast on Aristophanes (T 4) — Ἰστρος τὰ παρὰ τοῖς συγγραφεῦσιν ἀναλεγόμενος — to which 30 may be added the title Συναγωγή τῶν Ἀθίδων, though it is doubtful whether it comes from I. himself or was introduced by scholars who used the book because of the contents instead of a simple Ἀττικά<sup>15)</sup>. I regard the latter alternative as the more likely, for it is not easy to understand how the vague title Ἀττικά, rare for a book about Athens<sup>16)</sup> and actually merely meaning 'matters referring to Athens', could have replaced so 35 characteristic a title as Συναγωγή τῶν Ἀθίδων. The evidence of the quotations also favours this view: the work is quoted as Ἀττικά by Athenaios (F 10; 12), who has a certain authority in bibliographic matters, and by Plutarch, who probably consulted the work himself (F 7). It further is the title commonly used in the so-called Συναγωγή λέ-

- ξῆων χρησίμων<sup>17</sup>), and it occurs at least once in Harpokration<sup>18</sup>) who mostly has the other title but in forms so various that the suspicion of its not being original is increased: *Συναγωγὴ τῶν Ἀθιδῶν* or *τῆς Ἀθιδῶς* (F 14-15); *τῶν Ἀττικῶν Συναγωγῶν* (F 9); *Συναγωγῶν* or *Συναγωγῆς* (F 3; 13); 5 *τῶν Ἀθιδῶν* (F 2). It is regrettable that precisely in the scholia on Aristophanes (F 6; 27) the title is lacking; they would decide the question as Didymos had the *Ἀττικά* at hand and quoted it occasionally for facts from the 'Archaeology'. It will become evident later on that the question of the title in this case is neither an external matter nor unimportant<sup>19</sup>).
- 10 In the commentary on Sophokles *O. C.*, the main source of which is Didymos<sup>20</sup>), abundant use was made of another book of Istros, *viz.* the *Ἀτακτα* which contained at least four, and perhaps five books<sup>21</sup>). The facts that Attic matters are quoted from book 1, 3, (and 5?) and that the preserved fragments all refer to Athens is perhaps not a decisive proof 15 that the book concerned itself exclusively with Athens; but as I. wrote two more miscellaneous works the supposition is at least probable. Two works having their subjects in the same sphere are not uncommon for a grammarian<sup>22</sup>). Why he should have treated *e.g.* Hippolytos, Kolonos, the sacred olives in the *Ἀτακτα*, not in the *Ἀττικά*, cannot be stated with 20 certainty: the *Ἀτακτα* may have been a kind of supplement or, even more likely, they (like the *Ἑπομνήματα*?) were interpretative in their nature, *i.e.* they discussed *ζητήματα*, factual and textual questions which would have broken the continuity of the historical account or would have taken too much room. In any case, the *Ἀτακτα* is not the same work as the 25 *Ἀττικά*<sup>23</sup>): the former title (*Ἀτακτα*) belongs typically to grammarians, and it is not credible that it should have been corrupted from *Ἀττικά* in *all* passages. There is no doubt that the latter was I.'s main work about Athens: this is shown by its containing at least fourteen books, though probably not much more if the work was confined to the 'Archaeology'.
- 30 Among the products of I.'s wide-spread literary activity we can form a clear idea only of the *Ἀττικά* (and to a certain degree of the *Ἀτακτα*) with which we are specially concerned here. Of the 77 fragments of I. approximately one half refer to Athens; and of 44 fragments cited with a title of a book 23 come from books about Athens, the remaining 21 being 35 distributed among fourteen works most of which are quoted once only. A work bearing the title *Ἀττικά*, and even more so a *Συναγωγὴ τῶν Ἀθιδῶν* (*Ἀττικῶν*), was not an *Atthis* in the technical sense of the word. We may even have to suppose that I. deliberately avoided the by now conventional title of an account of Attic history for the simple reason that he did not



narrate the history of Athens: he did not treat, or even did not plan to treat, more than a certain period. The second alternative (if true) would be more interesting because the selection of one period would be in accord with the character of I. as a grammarian <sup>24</sup>). Nor is it surprising in a grammarian that this period was the 'Archaeology': not only was that the time treated by the poets whom Hellenistic scholars interpreted and from whom they took the subjects of their own poems, it was also the period in regard to which there were the greatest discrepancies among the Atthidographers themselves. The abundance of different stories and <sup>10</sup> (even more) of different explanations of facts in regard to the state, the cults, and individual figures almost clamoured for collection and grouping. For the historical time from Solon downward such an urgent need did not exist because the discrepancies were less and of a different kind: one glance at the citations from Atthidographers concerning that <sup>15</sup> epoch shows the fundamental difference. The fact seems to become indubitable if we take into account the peculiarity of the tradition: it really cannot very well be accidental that neither the *Attika* nor the *Atakta* is ever cited for historical matters, and that none of the fragments with historical contents (few anyhow) can be derived with certainty from <sup>20</sup> either of these two works <sup>25</sup>). On the other hand, the few cases in which datable fragments are cited with the numbers of the books show what we expect *a priori*: I. kept in the 'Archaeology' to the chronological sequence of the list of kings. In the first book were discussed the pre-human inhabitants of Attica (F 1) and perhaps the earliest cults and (political) <sup>25</sup> divisions of the State (F 2-3); in the third book Erichthonios was mentioned (F 4); the thirteenth and fourteenth books dealt with the story of Theseus (F 7-10). It is in accord with this chronological arrangement of the Ἀττικὰ (not, of course, of the Ἀτακτὰ) that the three great festivals of the Apaturia, Panathenaia, Oschophoria (F 2; 4; 8) were not grouped <sup>30</sup> together but were handled in the first, third, and thirteenth book, this distribution precluding at the same time any competing principle of arrangement according to subject-matter. What we have is not much, but the case is clear so far. What we cannot state with certainty is how far down the account of I. went: F 11 makes it appear credible that the trial <sup>35</sup> of Orestes was treated in the 14th book. If so I. may have ended his work with Kodros and the traditional abolition of royalty <sup>26</sup>).

These facts at the same time give us a notion of the design of what we may call a digest: I. did not re-edit the whole of the earlier *Atthides* or of their 'Archaeologies'; what he collected was (despite the description as

Συναγωγή) not the *Atthides* but the material derived from them<sup>27</sup>). Citations like F 6 Ἴστρος τὰ παρὰ τοῖς συγγραφεῦσιν καταλεξάμενος; F 8 περὶ Θησέως λέγων; F 10 καταλέγων τὰς τοῦ Θησέως γενομένας γυναῖκας confirm this interpretation, and at the same time distinctly show the nature of the work: 5 readers found conveniently gathered in one passage what the several authors had recorded *e.g.* about the Klepsydra or about the wives of Theseus. It is more difficult to decide whether I. supplied this material in the form of a continuous narrative interrupted at suitable places by enumerations of variants or of parallel accounts, or whether he gave it in a 10 sequence of independent sections — Περὶ Κλεψύδρας, Περὶ Θησέως γυναικῶν *etc.* To express it differently, each section (book) of his work, being more or less independent, may have consisted of a narrative with variants or of a series of excerpts headed by the names of the authors from whom they were taken. Are we to conceive the Ἀττικά as approximately like the 15 books Περὶ Ἰουδαίων and Χαλδαϊκὰ of Alexander Polyhistor (273 F 19; 79) or like the *collectanea* of the period of the emperors, the Ποικίλαι ἱστορίαι, Λειμῶνες or whatever their names were? Apparently the question has never been put accurately, but the dominant idea seems to be that the Ἀττικά was a book of excerpts<sup>28</sup>). In my opinion it is not only general considerations 20 founded on our knowledge of third century learned literature and the development of it which rouse doubts and cause us to find the parallels to I.'s digest not in late Hellenistic and Roman, but in early Hellenistic and pre-Hellenistic times, *viz.* in the mythographic Κύκλοι<sup>29</sup>), which then began to supersede the 'historical' Γενεαλογίαι, in the Τραγωί- 25 δούμενα (no. 12), and in the Βίοι like those of the Callimachean Hermippos<sup>30</sup>). In discussing these questions we must not start from the examination of the sources of Plutarch and others, which cannot be taken in hand until we have formed an idea of the nature of the Ἀττικά and know for what we must look<sup>31</sup>). Primarily we must found our 30 opinion on the fragments themselves. In consequence of their severe abridgement (particularly in the lexicographers) they yield little; in some cases it is even doubtful how much is I.<sup>32</sup>), and in any case it seems an unfounded prejudice to me to find him in every nest of quotations. But *e.g.* F 7 confronts us with two concrete questions: (1) did I., when col- 35 lecting his material confine himself to the Atthidographers proper? (2) did he, regularly or at least in the majority of the cases, cite by their names the authors he used? One is inclined *a priori* to answer the first question by 'no' and the second by 'yes'. The title Ἀττικά does not require a restriction which would be unsuited to the grammarian's

purpose of collecting all available material on some particular point, and F 6 speaks of συγγραφεῖς generally, not of οἱ τὰς Ἀτθίδας συγγράψαντες. On the other hand, the description of the nature of the work as being a συναγωγή and the probable precedent of Aristotle<sup>33</sup>), seem to require the citing of the excerpted sources by their names. But in the just mentioned F 7 doubts are raised at once by the fact that Plutarch, although he quotes I. and probably even consulted him himself in the Theseus Vita, gives the ἴδιος καὶ παρηλλαγμένος λόγος he found in him anonymously as ἐνίων λέγοντων. As Plutarch in other passages of the same Vita does not hesitate to name an author, particularly for versions that differ from the usual accounts<sup>34</sup>), the inference seems inevitable that he did not find the name in I.; it is corroborated by τινὲς δὲ . . . φασί in F 14 (one of the few verbatim quotations), by εἴποι δ' ἔν τις ὅτι ἀξιούσιν ἔνιοι in F 22 from the Ἄτακτα, and perhaps also by F 8 and F 20. This manner of quoting anonymously, particularly in works of a collective character, appears remarkable to us, but it was wide-spread in early learned literature, at least as far as prose sources are concerned. Certain parallels are the use made of predecessors without citing them (most easily to be observed in Aristotle's Ἄθπ.) and references to the ἐπιχώριοι instead of to those authors who introduced their tradition. Both this practice and the different treatment of poets are to be explained by the fact that genealogists and historians are regarded merely as transmitting poetic or epichoric tradition, not as independent witnesses; whereas the poets are the creators of tradition or at least the first and original witnesses to it. Early scholars therefore frequently, even if by no means invariably, cite poets by their names. Thus it is not impossible that the quotation of Hesiod in F 10 is taken from I., and that it was he who questioned its authenticity (not being the first to do so). But the fragments yield no certain evidence either for this assumption or for use being made of writers other than Atthidographers proper<sup>35</sup>). We shall therefore be able to maintain cautiously the negative answer to our first question, but we shall have largely to qualify the affirmative answer to the second (if we venture to make it at all on the basis of F 6). We cannot count on I. having always (or even mostly) cited his (prose) sources by name, nor can we tell whether he acted on definite principles in this respect. Did he perhaps cite by their names authors of particular importance for Athens, as for instance the Atthidographers or Pherekydes, leaving others anonymous; and were there among the latter not only groups of authors like the Μεγαρόθεν συγγραφεῖς in Plutarch's *Thes.* 10 (where this manner of quo-

tation has a certain justification) but even individual representatives of opinions diverging from the consensus of the Atthidographers or the general λόγος Ἑλλήνων? If so the anonymity may involve a certain amount of criticism.

- 5 This uncertainty is most unpleasant, but I am afraid that we cannot get rid of it because of our quite insufficient material. We have to keep in mind that I. belongs to the times of real learning and that he is writing for scholars who understand allusions and in whose hands he may assume far more books than *e.g.* Didymos can or does. On the whole I suppose
- 10 that the greater number of names adduced even by a Plutarch in his *Theseus* was much more owing to late Hellenism and the early Roman period than to the scholars of early Hellenism. It seems a typical case to me that in a fragment quoted verbatim from the *Τραγωιδούμενα* of Asklepiades of Tragilos the Scholiast on Pindar makes the addition ὡς
- 15 Φερεκύδης to the anonymous quotation *προσιστοροῦσι δὲ ξῖνοι* <sup>36</sup>). Nothing remains but to ask in each individual case (*e.g.* F 1) whether we are justified in suggesting that the name of a certain Atthidographer came through I. We shall rarely arrive at a safe result, but our judgement of the scholar I. depends on these results. General opinion which regards
- 20 him as a mere compiler, a kind of early Didymos, is certainly not based on adequate foundations, though the little we have of him does not create the impression of a great scholar; for being that the compiler is far too pronounced in him as in other disciples of Kallimachos. But he did have opinions of his own or, at least, in a given case he decided for one of
- 25 several divergent traditions by means of certain arguments or on the basis of certain methods <sup>37</sup>). Though we must always take into account severe abridgement, and can never feel ourselves on quite sure ground, especially because I. may have supported his opinions by quotations which dropped out in the course of the tradition, nevertheless *e.g.* F 27
- 30 as it stands can hardly fail to imply that I. pleaded for the form *ἔρηφορία* for the reason that the *πομπή* was meant for Herse; in F 4 he even seems to present a theory of his own about the development of the Panathenaia; also in F 1 and in some other fragments I. is quoted as an independent witness taking a different view from the Atthidographers <sup>38</sup>).
- 35 To sum up: our material, as far as it allows of a judgement, seems to preclude the idea that the *Attika* of I. was merely a collection of excerpts. The work was not a new *Atthis* if only because it was restricted to the 'Archaeology'; but for this limited period it was not a mere compilation but a new record. It differed from the preceding records not only

by being concerned exclusively and of deliberate choice with that section of Attic history which in Androtion and Philochoros had receded more into the background, but mainly because instead of only occasionally criticizing divergent views it tried to do justice to all by pointing continuously to the discrepancies in the reports and by distinguishing between the accepted opinion (πολλοί; πολλὸς λόγος), uniform in its main features whatever the variations in details, and the special versions (ἴδια). For the variants and special versions I. mentioned authorities sometimes by their names (particularly when they were poets?), sometimes (mostly?) anonymously as τινές or ἔνιοι, sometimes (when two main views were opposed to each other, as Athenian and Megarian tradition repeatedly were) by quotations of groups as οἱ μὲν — οἱ δέ, οἱ Μεγαρόθεν συγγραφεῖς, Ναξίων τινές (if we may derive from him ch. 10 and 20 of Plutarch's *Theseus*<sup>39</sup>). These differences are simply due to the fact that I. concerned himself with Athens as a grammarian, not as a historian. One best comprehends the widely different point of view from that of Atthidography by comparing I.'s voluminous literary activity as a whole with that, quite as voluminous, of the last and greatest Atthidographer. We spoke of the scholarly element as being essential in the nature of Philochoros<sup>40</sup>: he began his literary career as a learned antiquary (besides being interested in Athenian and other poets), and he remained that even though he wrote the comprehensive and final history of his town in the later decades of his life. But whether he wrote as a scholar or as a historian, nearly his entire activity is rooted in, and qualified by, nationalism; he is the last representative of this type which (apart from purely local writings) was never frequent<sup>41</sup>). Wherever in I. local patriotism becomes evident (e.g. in the Ἀποικίαι Αἰγυπτίων and even more in Περὶ Πτολεμαίδος) we find ourselves looking for external reasons; the main part of his work has no relation whatever to the country where he lives. The new science is international as Sophistry and Peripateticism were; from these predecessors it differs by being not only international but (to use a convenient term) classicistic as well. Its research is almost exclusively concerned with early Hellas, which the writers first felt to represent a finished period of history and which they came to regard more and more as being classic—the Hellas firstly of the great poets, subsequently of literature altogether. Of course, scholars do not limit themselves to literature; on the whole we discern two main groups which naturally sometimes overlap: there are scholars who solely (or mainly) deal with the texts, and there are others whose interests are

Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.)

mainly directed towards the material to be gained from the texts — philologists and antiquaries (to use modern terms), both feeling themselves to be γραμματικοί even if the antiquaries are sometimes denoted as ιστορικοί (συγγραφεῖς). I. himself no doubt belongs to the group of antiquaries. Like his master Kallimachos and his fellow-disciples Philostephanos, Hermippos *etc.* he never edited texts or prepared ὑπομνήματα to accompany texts. In their Ὑπομνήματα, Σύμμικτα *etc.* these authors were, as far as we can judge, concerned with the matter; they were the successors of the fourth century writers of Προβλήματα. If we conceive the Ὑπομνήματα of I. in this sense a number of fragments can easily be placed, and the difference between the Ἀτακτα and the Ὑπομνήματα<sup>42</sup>) is perhaps only this that the former centred round Athens, *i.e.* dealt with Tragedy, the latter round Homer and epic poetry.

Collective works like those of I. were of course used later on because they were convenient, but it is inherent in their nature (as in that of all learned literature) that the use made of them cannot easily be stated in detail; in other words, the very scanty legacy of I. as represented by the fragments cannot be much increased by an examination of the sources of the authors from the period of the Roman emperors<sup>43</sup>). In my opinion the direct use made of I. by authors like Plutarch and Pausanias is greatly overestimated: modern writers have regarded the books of I. as nothing but excerptor's patchwork, not paying sufficient attention to the fact that this collective literature also has a history. The three or four centuries from I. to Hadrian gave birth to the lexica and commentaries, to scholars like Didymos, Theon, and others who offered the material more conveniently and perhaps more accurately as well<sup>44</sup>). It is remarkable how many quotations from the *Attika* occur in the (later) lexica<sup>45</sup>) and how few in the scholia, whereas *Atakta*, *Symmikta*, *Hypomnemata* are cited in the scholia, which bring in other special works as well. The lexicographic sources of Stephanos used the *Eliaka* and the *Apoikiai*. It appears impossible to distinguish with any degree of certainty matter belonging to I. from that which is not his in, let us say, Didymos, except where actual quotations show the way. We get the impression that the majority of these books hardly survived the early empire whereas the *Attika* was used also later (perhaps even more than before) both by scholars and (if occasionally) by authors like Plutarch<sup>46</sup>), thus being regarded, in connexion with the general Atticistic movement, increasingly as I.'s main work. But the general conception that the *Attika* signifies the end of Athenian local history and/or that the appearance of

that work caused the end of Atthidography <sup>47</sup>) is wrong, or at least needs to be largely qualified. It is contradicted by the fact that the *Attika* is not an *Atthis* and did not supersede the *Atthides* (an epitome of Philochoros was made as late as in the second century A.D. <sup>48</sup>)), nor can I. have had this intention: the more important *Atthides* had increasingly extended the parts dedicated to the historical period and to contemporary history <sup>49</sup>), the *Attika* was restricted to the 'Archaeology'. At the utmost we might state conversely that the grammarian summarized the tradition handed down by local history for the period with which he was concerned because no new *Atthides* were appearing. Local Attic Historiography does not cease with I. but with Philochoros. It came to an end as a natural consequence of the historical fact that by the unfortunate issue of the Chremonidean War the history of Athens as an independent state came to an end; but the discontinuance of local historiography, *i.e.* of Atthidography, does not mean at the same time the end of local literature; it means a change of the sphere of interest of that literature and therefore of its form. After I. a similar work does not seem to have been written and, as things are, we had best assign to the learned grammarian a chapter by himself if only in order to separate him distinctly from the sphere of the Atthidographers.

## F(ragments)

(1) See on Philochoros 328 F 74. The text of the gloss makes it appear probable that what I. had to say about Titans in Attika has dropped out. It is not self-evident either that this was the special tradition of Marathon as recorded by Philochoros, or that the name of that author came into the lexicon from I. The lexicographers frequently cite I. for Athenian facts beside other authors (poets and prose-writers generally, not only Atthidographers), but almost more frequently alone <sup>1</sup>). The reason for this latter fact may be that they found him alone in their commentaries on the orators, or rather that they themselves used the *Ἀττικά* directly, supplementing other sources from that work. In these circumstances, and in consideration of the severe abridgement of Harpokration and the Synagoge, we can hardly ever decide whether the authors mentioned with him were brought in through him <sup>2</sup>). The case may, and probably does, stand differently in different passages.

(2) The two quotations do not refer to each other, *i.e.* Polemon did not criticise I. and I. did not supplement Polemon (supposing that was

possible chronologically). Polemon, probably when discussing one of the πύλακες<sup>1</sup>), enumerated three torch-races and arranged them according to their importance or that of the recipients<sup>2</sup>); why he enumerated only these three we need not discuss here. I. is speaking of the Apaturia (not 5 mentioned by Polemon) which he seems to have described somewhat fully<sup>3</sup>). The reason for doing so in the first book probably was that this festival was held to be characteristic for the Ionians<sup>4</sup>), and then F 2 may belong to that section in which I. treated the inhabitants of Attica. If that is correct I. must have interpreted the Ἀπατούρια as Ὀμοπατούρια<sup>5</sup>), 10 and by assigning the festival to the beginnings of history he actually made Athens the oldest Ionian town (if not the first town altogether<sup>6</sup>)) and at the same time the point of departure of all Ionians. Consequently he must have pushed into the background the story of Ion<sup>7</sup>) as well as that of the duel between Melanthos and Xanthos<sup>8</sup>), perhaps even the theory 15 of the Athenians originally being Pelasgians<sup>9</sup>). The rite described in the lexicographer's excerpt seems to place Hephaistos beside Dionysos and Demeter as one of the great benefactors of mankind. The text is defective and corrupt, but it is evident that according to I. the χρεία τοῦ πυρός had its origin in Athens: the Epitome has preserved the statement that the 20 custom of the Apaturia was the first λαμπάς and that it kept alive the memory of the gift of the god from which all civilization started<sup>10</sup>). In a similar manner Philochoros in his first and second books had derived all civilizing discoveries from Athens<sup>11</sup>). The custom described by I. is perhaps a *lampadophoria*, not a *lampadodromia*<sup>12</sup>); we have no other 25 evidence about it, nor do we know of a share of Hephaistos in the festival of the clans (or phratries). But it is out of the question that I. invented the custom; the Hephaisteia with its *lampadophoria* would have been sufficient for his purpose, and that festival could be dated back to primeval times as well as the Athenaia (F 4). Also a confusion is hardly conceivable<sup>13</sup>). In any case, our tradition about the Apaturia<sup>14</sup>) is not so 30 complete as to allow of our rejecting such a piece of information or of interpreting it away.

(3) Phot. *Lex.* s.v. Θεοίνιον (*Lex. rhet.* p. 264, 6; *Et. M.* p. 446, 40) ἱερὸν Διονύσου, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ γένος<sup>1</sup>). Hesych. s.v. Θεοίνια · θυσία Διονύσου Ἀθή- 35 νησι · καὶ θεὸς Θεόινος Διόνυσος. Schol. Lykophr. *Al.* 1247 Θεόινος · ὁ αὐτός (scil. Διόνυσος), ὡς Αἰσχύλος «πάτερ Θεόινε, μαινάδων ζευκτήριε» · καὶ Διονύσιος Σκυμναῖος (?)<sup>2</sup>) «μὰ τὰς Θεοίνου καὶ Κορωνίδας<sup>3</sup>) κόρας». According to the analogous articles of Harpokration, in which I. is cited as the only witness, the substance of what is said here about the Theoinia



and Dionysos Theoinos <sup>4</sup>) may be assigned to that writer, and the poetic evidence may have come in through him. Our knowledge of the cult is extremely poor; it is possible that all the facts mentioned may be traced back to the speeches made in the lawsuit between Krokonids and Koironids <sup>5</sup>), which roused the interest of the Attidographers, hardly of I. alone. If the latter discussed these matters in the first book, he must have regarded the Theoinia as a festival of the clan state; in this he was correct since it was mentioned in the oath of the γεραιαί <sup>6</sup>). As a slender thread connects the Theoinia with the Apaturia <sup>7</sup>), F 2 and 3 may come from the same context in which I. treated the old division of the people into phratriai and clans. In that case the δήμοι must be understood in the old sense as the villages or the residences of the clans, and I.'s expression τὰ κατὰ δήμους Διονύσια cannot be used as an argument for identifying the festival with the κατ' ἀγρούς Διονύσια <sup>8</sup>). On the other hand, the word γενῆται is ambiguous in an excerpt torn from its context: it may be meant generally (and it was meant thus if I. was speaking of the old division of the state), or it may refer to the Krokonids and Koironids. I. did treat of these, and there is hardly any doubt that F 15 belongs in the context of F 3. The historical situation probably is this: the cult of Dionysos Theoinos, which the two Eleusinian clans shared <sup>9</sup>), was at some time taken over by the State, perhaps on the occasion of the union of Eleusis and Athens. The cult must have been important, the oath of the γεραιαί shows that; and (if the development suggested is accepted) so does the worship of Theoinos at the Apaturia <sup>10</sup>). In the second half of the sixth century it may have been overshadowed by the new great cults of Dionysos; it did not, however, disappear: again the oath of the γεραιαί proves this, also the lawsuit from the second half of the fourth century, which surely was about the share of the two clans in the official celebration.

30 (4) Phot. Sud. s.v. Παναθήναια (Schol. Plat. *Parm.* 127 A) Ἀθήνησιν ἑορτῇ ἐπὶ τῷ ὑπὸ Θεσέως γενομένῳ συνοικισμῷ. πρῶτον ὑπὸ (Sud Schol. πρὸ τοῦ Phot) Ἐριχθονίου τοῦ Ἡφαίστου καὶ τῆς Ἀθηναῖς (Sud τῆς Ἀθήνης Schol Γῆς Phot), ὕστερον δὲ ὑπὸ Θεσέως συναγαγόντος τοὺς δήμους εἰς ἄστυ συναγ.-ἄστυ om. Phot). ἀγεται δὲ ὁ ἀγὼν διὰ πέντε ἐτῶν. Pausan. 8, 2, 1  
 35 Λυκάων δὲ ὁ Πελασγοῦ . . . . Λυκόσουράν τε γὰρ πόλιν ὠκισεν . . . καὶ Δία ὠνόμασε Λυκαῖον καὶ ἀγῶνα ἔθηκε Λύκαια. οὐκέτι (οὐχ ὅτι P<sup>1</sup> οὐχὶ L<sup>2</sup>) δὲ τὰ παρ' Ἀθηναίους Παναθήναια τεθῆναι πρότερα ἀποφαίνομαι· τούτῳ γὰρ τῷ ἀγῶνι Ἀθήναια ὄνομα ἦν, Παναθήναια (om. L) δὲ κληθῆναι φασὶν ἐπὶ Θεσέως ὅτι ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων ἐτέθη συνειλεγμένων ἐς μίαν ἀπάντων πόλιν. Plutarch. *Thes.*

24, 3 ἐν δὲ ποιήσας ἅπασι κοινὸν ἐνταῦθα πρυτανεῖον καὶ βουλευτήριον οὗ νῦν ἱδρύεται τὸ ἄστυ, τὴν τε πόλιν Ἀθήνας προσηγόρευσε καὶ Παναθήναια θυσίαν ἐποίησε κοινήν. (4) ἔθυσσε δὲ καὶ Μετοίχια τῆι ἕκτῃ ἐπὶ δέκα τοῦ Ἑκατομβαιῶνος, ἣν νῦν ἔτι θύουσιν. καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν ἀφείξας, ὡς περ ὠμολόγησε, 5 διεκόσμηε τὴν πολιτείαν κτλ.

In the mythical antecedents, which were given to the Panathenaia <sup>1)</sup> in local tradition as to the majority of the great festivals, there compete as the founders of the festival Erichthonios and Theseus. It is obvious that these two founders preclude each other, and equally obvious that 10 the Athenaia was invented in order to reconcile the contradictory traditions <sup>2)</sup>. Further, the bases of the two traditions can be recognized easily. Erichthonios because of the history of his birth and as the cult-fellow of the goddess was the indicated founder of her high festival, perhaps of her cult in Athens altogether. We must never forget that for 15 theological speculation (which is older than the literary species of the *Atthis*) Athena was not the only, and not even chronologically the first, deity of Athens, just as Ἀθηναῖοι is not the only, or the first, name of the inhabitants of the city; speculation arranged the cults and the names of the kings in a chronological sequence, and the Atthidographers ac- 20 cepted and developed the series <sup>3)</sup>. Variants are not lacking, but the naming of the people is always linked with the establishment of the Panathenaia: *Marm. Par.* A 10 Ἐριχθόνιος Παναθηναίος τοῖς πρώτοις γενομέ- νος ἄρμα ἐξευξε, καὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα ἐδείκνυε, καὶ Ἀθηναίους ὠνόμασε ~ *Plutarch. Thes.* 24, 3 τὴν τε πόλιν Ἀθήνας προσηγόρευσε (Theseus) καὶ Παναθήναια θυσίαν 25 ἐποίησε κοινήν. Probability favours the belief that the connexion (natural for ancient thinking) of the giving of a name to a people with the establish- ment of a national festival is not the invention of as late an author as Hellanikos, but that he accepted it as a tradition from the λόγοι ἀνδρες. This tradition was the creed, or rather the speculation, of the 30 sixth century at the latest, for the verses in the Catalogue of Ships (B 546 ff.) cannot be later: the whole of Attica is called δῆμος Ἐρεχθῆος μεγαλήτορος, ὃν ποτ' Ἀθήνη / θρέψε Διὸς θυγάτηρ, τέκε δὲ Ζεῖδωρος ἄρουρα, / καδ' δ' ἐν Ἀθήνησι εἶσεν, ἐὼι ἐν πῖονι νηῶι, and together with the two following verses ἔνθα δὲ μιν ταῦροισι καὶ ἀρνεῖοις ἰλάονται / κοῦροι Ἀθηναίων 35 περιτελλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν they may even have the Panathenaia in view <sup>4)</sup>. It is impossible to concede so early a date to the tradition about Theseus: the comparison of the passage of Plutarch quoted on p. 629, 39 ff. with Thukyd. 2, 15, 2 ἐν βουλευτήριον ἀποδείξας καὶ πρυτανεῖον ξυνώκισσε πάντας . . . καὶ Ξυνοίχια ἐξ ἐκείνου Ἀθηναῖοι ἔτι καὶ νῦν τῆι θεῶι ἑορτὴν δη-

μοτελῆ ποιούσιν shows incontestably that the Panathenaia did not supersede the Synoikia until after Thukydidēs<sup>5</sup>). Theseus as the founder of the Panathenaia is secondary, an invention perhaps of as late a time as the fifth century<sup>6</sup>).

- 5 Atthidographic tradition, as far as it goes, confirms this result. But it does not go far. Hellanikos, who introduced the tradition about Erichthonios into literature, was followed by Androtion and the indeterminable *Atthis* of the Parian Marble<sup>7</sup>). It is uncertain whether the general assumption is correct that Philochoros (328 F 8-9) also did. For the version
- 10 which makes Theseus the founder we have no name of an Atthidographer; but we are ignorant of what Kleidemos, Phanodemos, Melanthios, and Demon gave. We shall have to take these facts into account when judging the article of Harpokration: I. is quoted not for Theseus as the founder, but for the fact that the Panathenaia was called Athenaia
- 15 'before' or 'before him'. Strictly interpreted *πρὸ τούτου* should refer to Erichthonios, and the view which would result as that of I. cannot be called impossible *a priori*<sup>8</sup>). One might regard it as the answer to the *ζήτημα* why the chief goddess of Athens was not given a festival until the reign of the fourth king. The hypothesis that the Panathenaia was not the
- 20 first festival of Athena but an enlargement of more primitive Athenaia, might have been founded either on the particular connexion of Erichthonios with the agon of the apobatai<sup>9</sup>) or on the view that it was Erichthonios (Erechtheus) who 'gave the Athenians their name', *i.e.* that he, not Theseus, united Attica<sup>10</sup>). The grammarian I., who repeatedly treated
- 25 Homeric problems<sup>11</sup>), could refer for his conjecture to *Il.* B 546 ff., and the author of *Ἀττικὰ* to the fact that the war with Eleusis was dated under the same king. Nevertheless the tradition represented by the excerpts on p. 629, 30 ff. which connects the Panathenaia with Theseus and makes Athenaia precede it<sup>12</sup>) raises doubts, and the epitomized
- 30 condition in which the text of Harpokration has come down to us<sup>13</sup>) justifies us in feeling suspicious as to its reliability. The epitomist may have done more than abridge clumsily, he may have skipped a whole sentence which contained the rival version and *πρὸ τούτου* may actually have referred to Theseus. In this case we cannot tell whether the full text of
- 35 Harpokration cited the representatives of the Theseus version by name, or whether he contented himself with quoting I. who had preferred this version. But as we are not in a position to insert a name the possibility remains that it was I., and no earlier author, who invented the earlier Athenaia in order to unite the two contradictory traditions. Those who

do not regard him as a mere compiler will be inclined to take this possibility seriously.

(5) Hesych. s.v. 'Ομολώιος Ζεύς· Ὁθήβησιν οὕτω προσαγορεύεται ὁ Ζεὺς. Steph. Byz. s.v. 'Ομόλη (ὄμ- VP)· ὄρος Θετταλίας· Πausανίας θ̄ (8, 6). λέγεται 5 καὶ 'Ομολος· οἱ οἰκοῦντες 'Ομολοεῖς (-λεῖς? Mei). καὶ Ὁθηῶν <πύλαι (suppl. Holste, Mei) πρὸς τῷ ὄρει 'Ομολώιδες (-λοῖδες RVP), καὶ Ζεὺς 'Ομολώιος (-όιος RVP) τιμᾶται ἐν Βοιωτίαι. *Id.* s.v. 'Ομόλιον· πόλις Μακεδονίας καὶ Μαγνησίας· Στράβων ζ̄ (9, 5, 22? cf. II p. 78 Kramer)· τὸ ἔθνηκόν 'Ομολιεύς (-λοεύς R)· τὸ δὲ 'Ομολώιος (-ιον Mei) τεμενικόν (κητικόν Berkel) ἐστι 10 κατὰ πλεονασμὸν τοῦ ὦ. Schol. Theokrit. 7, 103a 'Ομόλη δὲ Θετταλίας ὄρος, ὡς Ἐφορος (70 F 228) καὶ Ἀριστόδημος ὁ Ὁθηβαῖος (383 F 5) ἐν οἷς ἱστορεῖ περὶ τῆς ἐορτῆς τῶν 'Ομολωίων (Meursius ὁμόλων K ὁμόρων U ὁμήρων r) καὶ Πίνδαρος ἐν τοῖς Ὑπορχήμασιν (F 113 Schr.). Schol. Lykophr. *Al.* 520 τριγέννητος θεὰ / Βοαρμία, Λογγᾶτις, 'Ομολωῖς, Βία] Βοαρμία δὲ καὶ 15 Λογγᾶτις παρὰ Βοιωτοῖς καλεῖται καὶ τιμᾶται, 'Ομολωῖς παρὰ Ὁθηβαίους (Tzetz, v 'Αθηναίους Schol.)· καὶ ὁ Ζεὺς παρ' αὐτοῖς 'Ομολώιος (Wentzel ὁμολωῖς Schol.), καὶ πύλαι 'Ομολωίδες (Tzetz πύλαιος ὁμολωῖς Schol.).

The citation of I. in the Synagoge is an obvious addition by a lexicographer to the information on Theban gods and localities found in early 20 literature and in the authors of *Thebaïka* (379 F 2; 383 F 5). It is difficult to tell in what connexion I. mentioned these matters concerning Thebes; for judging by F 7-8 it is improbable that the twelfth book already treated the reign of Theseus and the war of the Seven against Thebes. The fact that Lykophron knows an Athena Homolois does not help, for she also 25 seems to belong to Thebes<sup>1)</sup>. Just a possibility for placing the fragment appears if we combine F 6 with F 3 of Phanodemos, who assigned the sacrifice of the daughters of Erechtheus to a war of Boeotia with Athens. I.s reference to an Aeolian word is by no means foolish in view of the geographical sphere of the epithet, of the festival Homoloia, and of the 30 month Homoloios<sup>2)</sup>. It is remarkable anyhow that he explains the epithet etymologically, not deriving it ἀπὸ τόπου; this is the method of the Stoa and Apollodoros<sup>3)</sup>.

(6) Schol. RV Aristoph. *Lys.* 913 (Hesych. s.v. Κλεψύδρα)· ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει ἦν κρήνη ἢ Κλεψύδρα, πρότερον Ἐμπεδῶ<sup>1)</sup> λεγομένη. ὠνομάσθη δὲ Κλεψύδρα διὸ τὸ ποτὲ μὲν πλημμυρεῖν, ποτὲ δὲ ἐνδεῖν. ἔχει δὲ τὰς ῥύσεις ὑπὸ γῆν, 35 φέρουσα εἰς τὸν Φλεγρεώδη(?)<sup>2)</sup> λειμῶνα. Hesych. s.v. κλεψίρρυτον ὕδωρ· τὸ τῆς Κλεψύδρας. αὕτη δὲ ἐστὶ κρήνη Ἀθήνησιν, ἀπὸ τῆς ἀκροπόλεως ἐπὶ σταδίου εἴκοσιν ὑπὸ γῆν φερομένη, εἰς ἣν τὰ ἐμβαλλόμενα πάλιν θεωρεῖται ἀρχομένων τῶν ἐτησίων. For I. the severely abbreviated F 6 yields the important

fact that he collected the material; the material itself is lost: in the explanation of the name I have not hesitated to alter the first φησί to φασί; the difference between the wording of the scholion and the quotation in F 8, which unmistakably gives an excerpt from I., is evident. The context 5 in which I. mentioned the Klepsydra may have been the story of the daughters of Erechtheus<sup>3)</sup>: near the Klepsydra Kreusa conceived Ion by Apollo, bore and exposed him; the anonymous source in Pausanias I, 28, 4 is the Klepsydra: καταβᾶσι δὲ οὐκ ἐς τὴν κάτω πόλιν, ἀλλ' ὅσον ὑπὸ τὰ Προπόλαια πηγὴ τε ὕδατός<sup>4)</sup> ἐστὶ καὶ πλησίον Ἀπόλλωνος ἱερὸν ἐν σπηλαίῳ·  
 10 Κρεούση δὲ θυγατρὶ Ἐρεχθέως Ἀπόλλωνα ἐνταῦθα συγγενέσθαι νομίζουσιν. The gap following these words contained something about the cave sanctuary of Pan as is proved by the story about the runner Philippides; according to Aristoph. *Lys.* 909 ff. the spring was next to the sanctuary of Pan, and the statements in Euripides' *Ion*<sup>5)</sup> agree with this localisation. It is self-evident that the Klepsydra on the NW cliff of the 15 Akropolis<sup>6)</sup> is to be distinguished both from the spring(s) in the Asklepieion on the south slope<sup>7)</sup> and from the *Thalassa* in the temple of Erechtheus<sup>8)</sup>. But θαυμάσια are reported about all three: the spring of Erechtheus contains ὕδωρ θαλάσσιον and παρέχεται κυμάτων ἤχον ἐπὶ νότῳ  
 20 πνεύσαντι<sup>9)</sup>; about the spring of Asklepios Pliny narrates the same as the scholia on Aristophanes about the Klepsydra<sup>10)</sup>. The question may remain open whether this is a confusion<sup>11)</sup>, or whether others had transferred to the Klepsydra the miraculous story which topographically is perhaps better suited to the spring of Asklepios. At any rate, we under-  
 25 stand why I. collected the opinions of the authors: he probably was not able to unravel the contradictions of the tradition<sup>12)</sup>.

(7) We may take it for granted that I. in the *Attika* discussed the story of Theseus' mother Aithra (important also for the interpreter of Homer because of *Il.* Γ 144) in some detail: the story of the sons of Theseus, who 30 were certainly treated in all *Aithides*, was connected with her capture and sojourn in Troy. It is possible that Plutarch's whole ch. 34, which deals with the line of Homer<sup>1)</sup>, is an excerpt from this section of the *Attika*, even if greatly abridged. I.s manner of quoting variants anonymously<sup>2)</sup> has robbed us of the name of the author who narrated the 35 singular story of an offensive war of the Trojans with Greece—for one must so describe an enterprise in the course of which Paris fights in Thessaly and Hektor in the Peloponnese<sup>3)</sup>. Such tales remind us of the inventions of Ptolemaios Chennos, but as I. attests them for the second half of the third century B.C. at the latest we shall have to take them

more seriously. Two explanations seem to me to be possible: the story may be one of the answers to the ζήτημα arising from the line in the *Iliad*, and in that case it would derive from one of the early interpreters of Homer, who perhaps faintly remembered the campaign to Europe of the Mysians and Teucrians about which Herodotos knew <sup>4</sup>); or we have before us an invention with the purpose of taking the edge off Herodotos' criticism of the conduct of the Greeks <sup>5</sup>) by describing the campaign of Agamemnon as being the answer to an attack by the Trojans. We know that the guilt of the Trojans actually was discussed, even if not before Herodotos, and the invention was not so foolish if one started from the idea that Troy had officially sanctioned the rape, doing exactly what Herodotos (2, 118) believed to be impossible unless the booty had not been brought to Troy at all. Such an invention by which 'the Teucrians' appear as the mythical predecessors of Dareios and Xerxes seems to me possible for a poet, and if so, perhaps even more likely for an epic poet of the time of Alexander than for Choirilos. However this may be, it is of no value mythographically speaking <sup>6</sup>), and we shall waste no more time on it than on the tomb of Hektor at Thebes <sup>7</sup>).

(8) We had perhaps better leave open the questions whether this is a verbatim quotation, and whether the subject of νομίσει is not more likely to be Ἀθηναίους than Θεσέα, but we shall with some confidence assign to the excerpt from I. the explanation of ὄσχη with the anonymous variant ὄρεσχάς. The words περι Θεσέως λέγων prove that I. connected the institution of the festival with Theseus' return from Crete. Among the Atthidographers Demon (327 F 6) did the same, and him Plutarch quotes for the somewhat detailed description of the πομπή in *Thest.* 23, 2-5 <sup>1</sup>). Philochoros however reported differently: in his *Atthis* he seems to have assigned the institution of the Oschophoria to a much earlier time, and he probably criticised Demon <sup>2</sup>). Taken together F 4 and F 8 make it appear probable that I. preferred those versions which placed Theseus in the foreground. We cannot decide whether he did so because of the *Hekale* or because the majority of the Atthidographers took this line, for our tradition is even more defective here than for the Panathenaia.

(9) Lex. rhet. p. 307, 1 Bkr s.v. τραπεζοφόρος· ἱέρεια ἢ τὴν τράπεζαν παρακτιθεῖσα <sup>1</sup>) τῆι Ἀθηναίῃ. Hesych. s.v. τραπεζῶ <sup>2</sup>)· ἱέρεια τις Ἀθήνησιν. Lex. rhet. p. 273, 6 κομμῶ (sic)· ἢ κοσμοῦσα τὸ ἔδος τῆς Ἀθηναῖς ἱέρεια. *The* priestess of Athena is the priestess of Athena Polias, who was chosen from among the Eteobutads. Toepffler *A. G.* p. 122 referred to the honorary

decree for one of these priestesses from the middle of the third century B.C.: I G<sup>2</sup> II 776, 10 ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἡ ἱέρει[α τῆς Πολιάδος ἐπεμελήθη καλ]ῶς καὶ φιλοτιμ[ῶς τῆς τε κοσμήσεως τῆς τρ]απέζης κατὰ τὰ [πάτρια], which may show that *trapezo* and *kosmo* are rather subordinates to the priestess 5 than her colleagues. There is no connexion with the Oskophoria F 8 where *deiphophoroi* are functioning, and the context of F 9 remains obscure unless we connect it with F 25, assuming a detailed description of the cult (newly founded by Theseus?) of Athena on the Akropolis as the goddess of the new town.

10 (10) Plutarch. *Thes.* 29 εἰσι μέντοι λόγοι περὶ γάμων Θησέως καὶ ἕτεροι, τὴν σκηπὴν διαπεφυγότες, οὐτ' ἀρχὰς εὐγνώμονας οὐδ' εὐτυχεῖς τελευτὰς ἔχοντες. καὶ γὰρ Ἀναξίω τινα Τροϊζηνίαν ἀρπάσαι λέγεται, καὶ Σίνιν ἀποκτείναι καὶ Κερκυόνα συγγενέσθαι βίαι ταῖς θυγατράσιν αὐτῶν· γῆμαι δὲ καὶ Περιβοίαν τὴν Αἰαντος μητέρα καὶ Φερέβοιαν αὐθις καὶ Ἰόπην τὴν Ἴφικλέους· καὶ διὰ τὸν 15 Αἰγλης ἔρωτα τῆς Πανοπέως, ὥσπερ εἴρηται (20, 1-2), τὴν Ἀριάδνης ἀπόλειψιν αἰτιῶνται μὴ καλὴν γενέσθαι μηδὲ πρέπουσαν· ἐπὶ πᾶσι δὲ τὴν Ἑλένης ἀρπαγὴν κτλ. *Comp. Thes. et Romuli* 6, 1 καὶ μὴν τὰ περὶ τὰς ἀρπαγὰς τῶν γυναικῶν ἡμαρτημένα Θησεῖ μὲν εὐσχήμονος ἐνδεᾶ προφάσεως γέγονε. πρῶτον μὲν διττὰ πολλάκις· ἤρπασε γὰρ Ἀριάδνην καὶ Ἀντιόπην καὶ Ἀναξίω τὴν Τροϊζηνίαν, ἐπὶ 20 πάσαις δὲ τὴν Ἑλένην... αὐτὸς ὥραν ἔχων ἤδη γάμων πεπαῦσθαι καὶ νομίμων... ταῦτα μὲν ὑποψίαν ἔχει πρὸς ὕβριν καὶ καθ' ἡδονὴν πεπεᾶσθαι. It is generally acknowledged that Plutarch's catalogue comes from I. 1): he has practically the same eleven names<sup>3)</sup> that appear in the fragment (including those cited from Hesiod and Pherekydes) and also the distribution between rape and marriage<sup>4)</sup>. Only as he was writing the *Vita* he took the four most important affairs out of the catalogue and fitted them into the suitable passages of his narrative<sup>5)</sup>. The concurrence of Plutarch guarantees the completeness of the catalogue in F 10, but it is most severely contracted; perhaps Athenaios gives merely the index or the 30 introduction to the relevant section(s) in the *Attika*<sup>6)</sup>. We may form an idea of the individual treatment of the cases from the chapters in which Plutarch narrates the story of Ariadne and the rape of Helen; but surely I.s account was much fuller and more learned<sup>6)</sup>.

(11) Pausan. I, 28, 5 Ἄρειος πάγος... καὶ βωμός ἐστιν Ἀθηναῖς Ἀρείας, δὴν 35 ἀνέθηκεν (*scil.* Ὀρέστης) ἀποφυγῶν τὴν δίκην. τοὺς δὲ ἀργούς (Goldhagen ἀργυροῦς ο) λίθους, ἐφ' ὧν ἐστᾶσιν ὄσοι δίκας ὑπέχουσι καὶ οἱ δῖοι κόντες, τὸν μὲν Ὑβρεως τὸν δὲ Ἀναιδείας αὐτῶν ὀνομάζουσι. Zenob. *Prov.* 4, 36 θεὸς ἡ Ἀναΐδεια· αὐτὴ τέτακται ἐπὶ τῶν δι' ἀναισχυντίαν τινὰ ὠφελουμένων· φησὶ Θεόφραστος ἐν τῷ Περὶ νόμων Ὑβρεως καὶ Ἀναιδείας παρὰ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις εἶναι βω-

μούς. Cicero *De legg.* 2, 28 *nam illud vitiosum, Athenis quod Cylonio scelere expiato Epimenide Crete suadente fecerunt Contumeliae fanum et Impudentiae; virtutes enim, non vitia consecrare decet.* Clem. Al. *Protr.* 2, 26, 4 ὡσπερ ἀμέλει καὶ Ἐπιμενίδης ὁ παλαιὸς Ὑβρεως καὶ Ἀναιδείας Ἀθήνησιν ἀναστήσας βωμούς.

- 5 Apparently all witnesses refer to the two ἀργοὶ λίθοι which Pausanias simply designates thus <sup>1)</sup>, whereas Theophrastos calls them βωμοί, and Cicero (who ultimately may depend on him) says *fanum* like the lexicographer, who cites I. for the ἱερὸν of Anaideia (and for it alone <sup>2)</sup>). Anaideia was from the fourth century universally interpreted as ἀναισχυν-  
 10 τία (shamelessness), that being the one meaning of the word at that time <sup>3)</sup>. That this is a misinterpretation is proved by the evidence of Pausanias, the only matter of fact account which is probably correct: ὕβρις requires a contrast, and the attitude of the accuser can never have been denoted as ἀναισχυντία; the legal notion of αἰδεσις, known already to the laws of  
 15 Draco, yields the appropriate sense, 'the stone of unforgiveness' <sup>4)</sup>. We may assume that I. knew this meaning <sup>5)</sup>, for what Pausanias states is also said in Euripides (*Iph. Taur.* 961) ὡς δ' εἰς Ἄρειον ὄχθον ἦκον, ἐς δίκην / ἔστην, ἐγὼ μὲν θάτερον λαβὼν βάθρον, / τὸ δ' ἄλλο πρέσβειρ' ἤπερ ἦν Ἐρινύων. This suggests that the Attidographers mentioned the λίθος ἀναιδείας on  
 20 the occasion of one the trials before the Areopagos. If the number of the book is correct I. can only have done so in connexion with the trial of Orestes which took place under Demophon <sup>6)</sup>, and there is a contradiction to the tradition of Theophrastos (represented by Cicero and Clement) according to which the λίθοι were established as altars in historical times  
 25 by Epimenides; according to I. they may already have been standing when the first trial took place under Kekrops. This occurrence of a 'historical' and a mythical aition alongside of each other is not extraordinary in the *Atthides*, but we are seldom in a position to pronounce judgement about the relative age of the two traditions, which may be of equal value  
 30 in themselves, though I profoundly distrust Theophrastos' information in such matters <sup>7)</sup>. But at least we understand why the 'historical' tradition conceived the stones as being altars.

- (12) Plutarch. *Solon* 24 τῶν δὲ γινομένων διαθέσειν πρὸς ξένους ἐλαίου μόνον ἔδωκεν, ἀλλὰ δ' ἐξάγειν ἐκώλυσε, καὶ κατὰ τῶν ἐξαγόντων ἀρὰς τὸν ἀρ-  
 35 χοντα ποιῆσθαι προσέταξεν, ἥ τίθειν αὐτὸν ἑκατὸν δραχμὰς εἰς τὸ δημόσιον. (2) καὶ πρῶτος ἄξων ἐστὶν ὁ τοῦτον περιέχων τὸν νόμον. οὐκ ἂν οὖν τις ἠγγῆσαιτο παντελῶς ἀπιθάνους τοὺς λέγοντας, ὅτι καὶ σύκων ἐξαγωγῇ τὸ παλαιὸν ἀπειρητο, καὶ τὸ φαίνειν ἐνδεικνύμενον τοὺς ἐξάγοντας κληθῆναι συκοφαντεῖν. Phot. *Sud.* s.v. συκοφαντεῖν (Schol. *Plat. Rep.* 340 D; *Et. M.* p. 733, 38 ff.; cf. Schol.



rec. Aristoph. *Plut.* 31; 873; *Lex. rhet.* p. 304, 30 Bkr) · τὸ ψευδῶς τινὸς κατηγορεῖν. κεκλήσθαι δέ φασι τοῦτο παρ' Ἀθηναίους πρῶτον εὐρεθέντος τοῦ φυτοῦ τῆς συκῆς, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο κωλυόντων ἐξάγειν τὰ σῦκα · τῶν δὲ φαινόντων τοὺς ἐξάγοντας συκοφαντῶν κληθέντων, συνέβη καὶ τοὺς ὀπωσοῦν κατηγοροῦντάς τι-  
 5 νων φιλαπεχθιμόνως οὕτως προσαγορευθῆναι.. Schol. RV Aristoph. *Plut.* 31 (Suda s.v. συκοφάντης) · λιμοῦ γενομένου ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ τινὲς λάθρα τὰς συκάς τὰς ἀφιερωμένας τοῖς θεοῖς ἐκαρποῦντο · μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα εὐθηνίας γενομένης κατηγοροῦν τούτων τινές, καὶ ἐκεῖθεν συκοφάνται λέγονται. Festus Pauli p. 393 Lindsay *sycophantas appellatos hac de causa dicunt: Atticos quondam*  
 10 *iuvenes solitos aiunt in hortos intrumpere ficosque deligere. quam ob causam lege est constitutum ut, qui id fecisset, capite truncaretur; quam poenam qui persequerentur ob parvula detrimenta, sycophantias appellatos.* Athen. 3, 6 p. 74 F: Φιλόμνηστος δ' ἐν τῷ Περι τῶν ἐν Ῥόδω Σμινθείων (527 FI) φησίν·  
 15 «ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ συκοφάντης ἐντεῦθεν προσηγορεύθη διὰ τὸ εἶναι τότε τὰ ἐπιζήμια καὶ τὰς εἰσφοράς σῦκα καὶ οἶνον καὶ ἔλαιον, ἀφ' ὧν τὰ κοινὰ διώκουσιν, καὶ τοὺς ταῦτα πράττοντας καὶ εἰσφαίνοντας (εἰσπρ- καὶ φαίνοντας Kaibel) ἐκάλουν, ὡς ἔοικε, συκοφάντας, αἰρούμενοι τοὺς ἀξιοπιστάτους τῶν πολιτῶν».

It is by no means certain that the passage in Plutarch's *Vita of Solon* is taken directly from I. 1); but whether or no, its importance consists in  
 20 showing that the laws of Solon did not contain a special prohibition of the export of figs 2): Plutarch, noting the general prohibition of the export of home-produced food, admits the possibility (οὐ παντελῶς ἀπιθάνους) that 'in old times' a particular prohibition concerning figs did exist, and that  
 25 subsequently all informers were called sycophants; i. e. he admits in fact that the etymology underlying the parallel tradition copied above may be correct 3). On what occasion I. mentioned sycophancy cannot be said with certainty, but it must have been in the period of the kings and long before Solon's legislation. There may have been a digression on Attic figs, and, in any case, I. s τότε πρῶτον (like the τὸ παλαιὸν of Plutarch and the  
 30 Scholia on Aristoph. *Plut.* 873) should be interpreted according to the tradition which assigned the prohibition to the time of the 'invention' of figs. The gift of the fig is one of the titles to glory belonging to Athens and was certainly mentioned in several *Atticides*; the lexicographical tradition may have used one of them. Comparing for instance Pausan.  
 35 I, 37, 2 about Phytalos in Lakiadai, who received the gift from Demeter, we state that the opening of the speech of Magnos in Athenaios' section about figs 4), refers to this tradition, and the chapter of Aelian enumerating the inventions of the Athenians probably refers to it as well 5). Philomnestos must also have had in mind a time which did not yet

possess coined money <sup>6</sup>); he gives a unique tradition, and we should like to know its source. In any case, the vague statements of a date all point to the earliest times, even before the gift of corn. There is no difficulty in assuming that I. based the etymology, which he either introduced or

5 took over, on the special esteem in which this earliest fruit was held. He rightly was not disturbed by the reflection that the Athenians were represented as behaving differently with regard to figs and to corn.

(13) Συναγ. Λεξ. χρῆσ. p. 403, 32 Bkr; Lex. rhet. p. 208, 28 Bkr; Et. M. p. 109, 12; Macrob. Sat. I, 12, 14 *sicut apud Athenienses ἀνθεστηριῶν. . .*

10 *vocatur ab eo quod hoc tempore cuncta florescant.* In ἐν τοῖς probably the number of a book is contained; ἐν τῷ ζ̄ would be palaeographically easy, but it would tell us nothing because we do not know the contents of book VI; Phanodemos (325 F 11/12) dealt with the Anthesteria detailedly in the Orestes story.

15 (14) Demosth. 47, 69 ἡμεῖς (the exegetai; see *Atthis* p. 12) τοίνυν σοι τὰ μὲν νόμιμα ἐξηγησόμεθα . . . πρῶτον μὲν ἐπενεγκεῖν δόρυ ἐπὶ τῇ ἐκφορᾷ, καὶ προαγορεύειν ἐπὶ τῷ μνήματι εἴ τις προσήκων ἐστὶ τῆς ἀνθρώπου, ἔπειτα τὸ μνήμα φυλάττειν ἐπὶ τρεῖς ἡμέρας. Pollux 8, 65 δόρυ ἐπὶ τῇ ἐκφορᾷ ἐπὶ τῶν βιαίως ἀποθανόντων ἐπεφέρετο, καὶ αἱ προθέσεις δὲ διὰ τοῦτο ἐγίνοντο, ὡς

20 ὁρᾶιτο ὁ νεκρὸς, μὴ τι βίαιον (ν βιαίως ο) πέπονθεν. I. is citing τινές for a special point <sup>1</sup>): at the burial of Prokris her father Erechtheus as the next of kin followed a certain Attic custom <sup>2</sup>). The custom precedes the trial of Kephalos before the Areopagos where again Erechtheus must have been the accuser. We find this trial as one of the four mythical trials for the

25 first time in the *Atthis* of Hellanikos <sup>3</sup>), and it is not likely that his successors dropped it; τινές are therefore not the Atthidographers, but it may be one of them who embellished the story. Beyond his noting the speciality we know nothing of I.'s account: there is no argument in favour of deriving *Bibl.* 3, 197-198 from him <sup>4</sup>); in a story narrated by all gen-

30 ealogists this conjecture is improbable *a priori*, nor can it be proved by F 65. This story, which is hardly pure I. <sup>5</sup>) and whose coming from the *Atthika* is uncertain, might be subjoined to F 14 if the *Atthides* narrated that Kephalos after having been exiled by the Areopagos went to Thebes.

We do not know whether they, or one of them, did; the *Bibliotheca* did

35 not <sup>6</sup>). There is no need therefore to discuss here the tale of Kephalos with its many versions, or even the question whether the part the Areopagos plays in it is at all early <sup>7</sup>).

(15) Lex. rhet. p. 273, 7 Bkr Κοιρωνῖδαι · γένος Ἀθήνησιν ἀπὸ Κοίρωνος, δεῖν ἀδελφὸς Κρόκωνος · καὶ Κροκωνῖδαι <sup>1</sup>) γένος ἱερὸν Ἀθήνησιν. ἀμφοτέροι δὲ

ἦσαν παῖδες Τριπτολέμου. Pausan. I, 38, 2 καὶ διαβάσει τοὺς 'Ρειτοὺς πρῶτος  
 ὀικει Κρόκων, ἐνθα καὶ νῦν ἐτι βασιλεία καλεῖται Κρόκωνος. τοῦτον Ἀθηναῖοι  
 τὸν Κρόκωνα Κελεοῦ θυγατρὶ συνοικῆσαι Σαισάραι (βαι- PL<sup>1</sup> y) λέγουσιν. λέ-  
 γουσι δὲ οὐ πάντες, ἀλλ' ὅσοι τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Σκαμβωνιδῶν εἰσίν. ἐγὼ δὲ Κρόκω-  
 5 νος μὲν ἀνευρεῖν τάφον οὐχ οἶός τε ἐγενόμην. It is not certain whether F 15  
 belongs to the context of F 2-3, i.e. whether I. in connexion with the  
 Apaturia treated the (or some) Attic clans in his first book; it is certain  
 that the Krokonidai and Koironidai were grouped together because  
 they have the same ancestor. His name is supplied by the Lexeis, but it  
 10 is not possible simply to insert it into the only sentence of I. which Harpo-  
 kration excerpted. What is preserved are the scanty remains of a tradition  
 the contradictions of which Pausanias, too, attests<sup>2</sup>): it seems hardly  
 probable that the Koironidai did acknowledge the pedigree given in the  
 speech and adopted by I. (or so it seems) with some caution<sup>3</sup>). It is  
 15 usually assumed that I. enumerated the divergent traditions, but atten-  
 tion should be paid to the fact that Harpokration attests the other two  
 alleged names of the clan<sup>4</sup>) not from I. but from the speech itself.

(16) Schol. Aristoph. *Ekkh.* 128 ὁ περιστῆρχος, περιφέρειν χρῆ τὴν γαλήν]  
 ὁ τῶν καθαρσίων προηγούμενος ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις· περίστια γὰρ τὰ κα-  
 20 θάρσια. Schol. Aischin. I, 23 ἐπειδὴν τὸ καθάρσιον περιενεχθῆ καὶ ὁ κῆρυξ  
 τὰς πατρῖους εὐχὰς εὐξεται] ὁ λεγόμενος περιστῆρχος ἱερεῖον λαβῶν τούτου  
 καθαίρει τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. τοῦτο λέγεται κάθαρμα καὶ καθάρσιον· Ἀριστοφάνης  
 Ἀχαρνέυσι (44) «πάρθ' ὡς ἂν ἐντὸς ἦτε τοῦ καθάρματος». — ἔθος δὲ ἦν  
 καθαίρειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ τὰ θέατρα μικροῖς χοιριδίοις, ἃ καθάρσια ἐκάλουν,  
 25 καὶ προσηγορεύοντο οἱ περικαθαίροντες περιστῆρχοι<sup>1</sup>). Schol. Aristoph.  
*Ach.* 44 εἰώθασιν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι θύειν δέλφακα καὶ ραίνειν τὰς καθέδρας τῶι  
 αἵματι αὐτοῦ εἰς τιμὴν τῆς Δήμητρος, ἐπειδὴ τοὺς καρπούς αὐτῆς βλάπτει<sup>2</sup>).  
 — ἄλλως· ὅτι ἐκαθαίροντο (Duebner καθαίροντο R κ-αι V) οἱ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίαι  
 30 χοιριδίων ἐπὶ καθάρσει τῶν τόπων κάθαρμα ἐκαλεῖτο, ὃ δὲ περικαθαίρων καθαρ-  
 τῆς. Harpokrat. s.v. καθάρσιον.<sup>3</sup>) Αἰσχίνης κατὰ Τιμάρχου. ἔθος ἦν Ἀθήνησι  
 καθαίρειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ τὰ θέατρα καὶ ὄλωσ τὰς τοῦ δήμου συνόδους μι-  
 κροῖς πάνυ χοιριδίοις, ἅπερ ὀνομάζον καθάρσια. τοῦτο δ' ἐποίουν οἱ λεγόμενοι  
 περιστῆρχοι, ὅπερ ὀνομάσθησαν οὕτως ἦτοι ἀπὸ τοῦ περιστεῖχειν ἢ ἀπὸ τῆς  
 35 ἐστίας. Hesych. s.v. περιστῆρχος· ὁ περικαθαίρων τὴν ἐστίαν καὶ τὴν  
 ἐκκλησίαν. *Id.* s.v. περίστιον (M. Schmidt περιστητον M) ἐπὴν τὸν νεκρὸν  
 ἐκπέμφαντες ὑποστρέψωσι, καὶ τὸ καθάρσιον ποιήσωσιν. See Eitrem  
*Opferritus*, 1914, p. 177; Hanell *R E* XIX I, 1937, col. 859. The passages  
 concerning the περιστῆρχοι which explain Aristophanes and Aischines

refer almost exclusively to the Assembly and the theatre; the second gloss of Hesychios about the *περίστια* alone carries the ritual into a somewhat wider context, and I. is quoted because he attests the same ritual not only for the *σύνοδοι τοῦ δήμου*, but for temples and sacred buildings in general <sup>4</sup>). We cannot tell in what connexion the explanation occurred, and I cannot suppress the suspicion that F 16 is more likely to belong in the *Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις* which Photios quotes with *ἐν ταῖς Ἀττικαῖς* (F 23b).

(17) The *ζήτημα* is the location, or rather the identification, of the place which Sophokles called the *πέτρα νιφάς*: it was found either in the *λεία πέτρα*, a landmark unknown to us of Kolonos itself, or in Aigaleos. I. is cited because of his statement that the two are close to each other, or (as one might say) that the deme Kolonos comprehends a part of Aigaleos; both names occur in the passage taken from him which is not fully excerpted <sup>1</sup>). The excerpt does not read as if it belonged to 'a general topographical description of Attica' which I. 'gave before starting his narrative' <sup>2</sup>), but like the enumeration of points marking a boundary <sup>3</sup>). We cannot recognize what it was that was bounded <sup>4</sup>). Nor can we decide whether a scholiast (Didymos?) was the first to excerpt the borderline drawn by I. from a context which we cannot determine, or whether I. himself treated the *ζήτημα* pointing to the course of some line of demarcation in order to explain the difficulty. Judging from the character of the *Aiakta* <sup>5</sup>) the second alternative is by no means impossible.

(18) Cf. Et. M. p. 747, 52 ff. (see Phanodemos 325 F 14). Surely, like F 19, from the treatment of a passage in a Euripidean tragedy, *Hippolytos* or *Iph. Taur.* 1446/7. Oppermann enumerated the several interpretations of the epithet in RE V A col. 34 f. We know no earlier representative of that given by I.; but that does not prove that he was the first to give it or that Apollodoros was criticizing him.

(19) See on Philochoros 328 F 188.

(20) Schol. Aischin. I, 188 ταῖς Σεμναῖς] τρεῖς ἦσαν αἱ λεγόμεναι Σεμναῖ θεαὶ ἢ Εὐμενίδες ἢ Ἐρινύες, ὧν τὰς μὲν δύο τὰς ἐκατέρωθεν Σκοπᾶς ὁ Πάριος πεποιήκεν ἐκ τοῦ λυχνίτου λίθου, τὴν δὲ μέσην Κάλαμις. οἱ δὲ Ἀρεοπαγῖται τρεῖς τοῦ μηνὸς ἡμέρας τὰς φοινικὰς δίκας ἐδίκαζον ἐκάστηι τῶν θεῶν μίαν ἡμέραν ἀπονέμοντες. ἦν δὲ τὰ πεμπόμενα αὐταῖς ἱερὰ πόπανα καὶ γάλα ἐν ἄγγεσι κεραικοῖς. φασὶ μέντοι αὐτὰς οἱ μὲν Γῆς εἶναι καὶ Σκότους, οἱ δὲ Σκότους καὶ Εὐωνύμης (Baiter-Sauppe ἐωνύμης, -μου Mss), ἦν καὶ Γῆν ὀνομάζεσθαι. κληθῆναι δὲ Εὐμενίδας ἐπ' Ὀρέστου, πρότερον Ἐρινύας καλουμένας. The pro-

venance of the fragment favours its coming from the *Atakta*; and if so we may suggest the trial of Orestes and the discussion of some passage in a tragedy where the trial was mentioned. The scholion on Aischines, judging by the systematic composition and the completeness of the summary, suggests Apollodoros. It is quite correct that the scholion contains Polemon and I., but Wellmann's (*l.c.* p. 13 ff.) manner of distributing it between the two authors seems too naïve. The scholia on Sophokles quote I. for the genealogy, and I think we may safely attribute to him the name of the father given in the scholia on Aischines <sup>1)</sup>. It is uncertain whether the following quotation of ἔνιοι about the alteration of the name belongs to I. The tradition about the sacrifice offered by Orestes in the Peloponnese, which is rather unsuitably attached by καί (probably because of the abbreviation), I should like to derive from a historian of religion, Apollodoros for choice, who is largely used in these scholia. It is again uncertain whether I. came into the scholion through him or through Didymos. The derivation from I. of the quotation of Epimenides is merely due to the interpolation of a line, metrically faulty, in the scholia on Lykophron; the position of the quotation also makes this derivation improbable.

<sup>20</sup> (21) The article seems to be wholly taken from Didymos who certainly quoted Diodoros, his authority for the demes, and probably I. Where the latter happened to mention the two demes, or one of them, remains obscure. But if he had treated the reform of Kleisthenes, giving the list of the demes, we should find his name as witness for a deme more frequently at least in Harpokration. The description in F 17, even if it gives the boundary of a deme and even if taken from a list, is used by I. (who may well have had Diodoros before him) for the interpretation of Sophokles.

<sup>30</sup> (22) The composition of the scholion, which seems to be severely abbreviated, is not clear: possibly several versions have been fused together; also the text is not altogether certain. I do not venture to decide <sup>1)</sup> whether either Akestodoros or Andron reached Didymos through I. who probably treated the Eumolpos problem at some length. It would be to no purpose here to study exhaustively the whole tradition <sup>35</sup> once again <sup>2)</sup>; anyhow we cannot restore the details of I.'s own opinion, because the excerpt omits the name of Eumolpos' father. But there are in the main two answers to the ζήτημα, if we set aside the numerous secondary combinations and variants partly due to the introduction of Musaios into the Eleusinian sphere: (1) the founder of the mysteries

Jacoby, *Fragm. Griech. Hist.* III b (Suppl.)

has no connexion at all with the Thracian, *i.e.* it is simply a case of homonymy; (2) he is a descendant, usually the fifth, of the Thracian, and in that case he belongs approximately to the time of Theseus. Aristoxenos stated the same discrepancy in regard to Musaios, *ὅτι οἱ μὲν ἐκ Θράκιης εἰρήκασι τὸν ἄνδρα, οἱ δὲ αὐτόχθονα ἐξ Ἐλευσίνος*. Whether or not Attica (Eleusis) is the original home of Eumolpos <sup>3)</sup>, the combination of the two was wide-spread as early as about 400 B.C.; <sup>4)</sup> Andron and Akestodoros represent versions of the second alternative, while I. is quoted for the first which does not acknowledge the Thracian at Eleusis. This may have been the tradition of the family of the Eumolpids themselves: as a son of Deiope and a grandson of Triptolemos Eumolpos belongs to the autochthons of Eleusis as they are called by Aristoxenos and by the authorities of Akestodoros. They form the first stratum of the population in Eleusis comparable to the Titans in Attika (F 1). The evidence for this tradition is scanty and rather late, but there are variants which prove it to have a certain antiquity <sup>5)</sup>, and we may assume that I. found it in at least one of his Atthidographic sources. But we can cite no names; the *Atthis* of the Parian Marble probably already represents a combination of the Eleusinian and the Thracian origins of the family.

<sup>20</sup> (23) Pollux 7, 184 *καὶ αἱ προβάτων ἡλικίαι· τὸν μὲν ἀπὸ γονῆς εἰποις ἄν μωσχίον <sup>1)</sup>, τὸν δ' ἔτειον <sup>2)</sup> ἄρνα, εἶτα ἀμνόν, εἶτα ἀρνεῖόν, ὅς καὶ ἀρὴν παρὰ τοῖς ποιηταῖς καλεῖται <sup>3)</sup>, εἶτα λιπογνώμονα*. We shall have to judge cautiously of the character of a book which is cited once only, but we may assume that the author of *Attika* and *Atakta* frequently had to explain 'glosses' in documents sacred and profane <sup>4)</sup>. It is comprehensible that he collected the results in a special book which he (as the first?) inscribed *Λέξεις* instead of *Γλῶσσαι*; as far as we can see he had no other linguistic interests. We shall therefore not expect him to have treated of the vocabulary of Homer and other poets; on the other hand he hardly collected the Attic glosses for his own use in poems <sup>5)</sup>.

(24) About the days sacred to Athena see on Philochoros 328 F 189. In regard to the equation of Athena and Selene Siebelis already pointed to the fact that on the one hand Athena was identified with Isis <sup>1)</sup>, on the other hand Isis with Selene <sup>2)</sup>. It is uncertain on what occasion I. mentioned these matters: the *τρίτη φθίνοντος* is the principal day of the great Panathenaia, which he had treated in the third book of his *Attika* (F 4). But there are other possibilities, *e.g.* the connexion of Athens with Sais (325 F 25), where Isis had long been called Athena.

(25) Eustath. *Il.* X 451 p. 1279, 40 *διὸ κατὰ τοὺς παλαιούς Ἀθήνησιν*

Αἰδοῦς καὶ Ἀφελείας ἦν βωμὸς περὶ τὸν τῆς Πολιάδος νεών, καθὰ καὶ Πανσανίας (F 18 Schw.) ἱστορεῖ, ἃς οἱ μὲν παιδαγωγούς, οἱ δὲ τροφούς τῆς θεᾶς γενέσθαι φασίν. ἔστι δὲ αὐτὸ ἀνιγμὰ τοῦ χρῆναι τὸν διδασκόμενον ἢ τὰ πρὸς φρόνησιν Ἀθηναῶν ἢ τὰ πρὸς ἄλλας τέχνας, ὧν Ἀθηναῖα ἐπιστατεῖ, αἰδῶ τε 5 τρεῖν εἰς τοὺς διδασκάλους καὶ ἀφελῶς αὐτοῖς προσφέρεσθαι καὶ ἀπεριέργως οἶα μὴ εἰδότας· τὸ γὰρ ἔξω τοῦ δέοντος περιεργον πονηρίαν τε ἔχει ἀπρεπῆ καὶ τοὺς διδασκάλους λυπεῖ. ὅτι δὲ ἀφέλειαν οὐ μόνον ἐπὶ ἀπλότητος οἱ παλαιοὶ ἐτίθουσαν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπὶ μεγαλείου τινὸς καὶ ἐνδοξότητος, ἐν ῥητορικοῖς δηλοῦται λεξικοῖς. Hesych. s.v. Αἰδοῦς βωμὸς· Ἀθήνησιν ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει Αἰδοῦς καὶ 10 Ἀφελείας (ν φιλικίας Μ) εἰσι βωμοὶ πρὸς ταῖς ἱερῶν. Synag. Lex. p. 355, 16 Bkr αἰδῶ· . . . καὶ ἡ τροφός τῆς Ἀθηναῶν καὶ ὁ βωμὸς ὁ ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει. Schol. Aischyl. *Prom.* 12 παρὰ Ἀθηναίους Αἰδῶς τιτηνὸς Ἀθηναῶν, Τόλμησ τε καὶ Ἀναιδείας τε μένη παρὰ αὐτοῖς. About a possible connexion with F 9 see above. We are ignorant about a goddess Apheleia otherwise; the 15 excerpts from an enumeration of 'personifications' <sup>1)</sup> worshipped in Athens omit her. Of course, that is no reason for doubting the existence of the cult, the location of which on the Akropolis is also certain <sup>2)</sup>. What notions either the man in the street or theological speculation connected with the figure I do not know <sup>3)</sup>; the allegorical explanation in Eustathios 20 is late and ridiculous.

(26) I. s name at the end of those historians who believed in the Amazon of Alexander makes it appear possible that it was Plutarch himself who added him to the list. One might think of Theseus' expedition to the Amazons or their attack on Athens (F 10).

25 (27) Hesych. s.v. ἀρρηφορία· ἐκατέρως λέγουσιν οἱ συγγραφεῖς· καὶ μὲν διὰ τοῦ εἰ ἔρρηφορία διὰ τὸ τῆς Ἐρσης ἐγκατελιῆσθαι τῇ πομπῇ (Jas τὴν πομπὴν Μ), ἐὰν δὲ διὰ τοῦ αἰ, ἐπεὶ ἐπ' ἀρρητοῖς συνέστη. *Id.* s.v. ἐρρηφόροι· οἱ τῇ Ἐρση ἐπιτελοῦντες τὰ νομιζόμενα. Et gen., Et. M. p. 149, 13 ἀρρηφόροι καὶ ἀρρηφορία· ἑορτὴ ἐπιτελουμένη τῇ Ἀθηναίᾳ ἐν Σχιροφοριῶνι μηνί· λέγεται δὲ καὶ διὰ 30 τοῦ εἰ ἔρρηφορία. παρὰ τὰ ἄρρητα καὶ μυστήρια φέρειν· ἢ ἐὰν διὰ τοῦ εἰ, παρὰ τὴν Ἐρσην τὴν Κέκροπος θυγατέρα Ἐρσηφορία· ταύτη γὰρ ἦγον τὴν ἑορτήν. οὕτως Σαλοῦστιος. We cannot go here into the question of the connexion between Arrephoria, Arretophoria <sup>1)</sup> and (H)ersephoria, but the general assumption that the connexion of Herse with the Errephoria is an ety- 35 mological invention of I. seems to me to turn facts upside down. The scholion attests a πομπή for Herse; what Pausanias I, 27, 3 records about the two ἀρρηφόροι <sup>2)</sup> of Athena (Pandrosos) is the very contrary of a πομπή, a real ἄρρητα φέρειν which also happens in the cult of Demeter for instance. The scholiast evidently distinguishes not only two different

spellings but two different ceremonies as well. The tradition about the daughters of Kekrops distinctly shows both their union in a group and their connexion with Kekrops to be secondary; even after they had been grouped in mythography distinct vestiges of original independence remain <sup>3</sup>). That applies even more to Herse (who is not exclusively Athenian) than to Aglauros and Pandrosos. In view of the scantiness of our knowledge it would be imprudent to deny that she had a *πομπή* of her own. But this does not mean that *ἀρρηφόροι* and *έρσηφόροι* are different words, for there was *ersephoria* in other cults as well: we find *έρσηφόροι* <sup>10</sup> β Χλόης Θέμιδος, and *έρσηφόροι* β Είλειθυίας ἐν Ἄγραις on theatre seats <sup>4</sup>), and another inscription adds *ersephoroi* of Demeter and Kore <sup>5</sup>).

(28) The Χαλκοῦς ὁδός occurs as a landmark in F 17, and F 28 yields nothing beyond that. It is questionable whether it is a separate fragment at all, *i.e.* whether I. treated the legend of the place.

<sup>15</sup> (29) We need not follow up here the course of the discussion as far as it can be evolved from the scholia <sup>1</sup>). The ζήτημα consists in this that the facts of the cult seem to contradict the reference of the verses to Demeter and Kore: (1) negatively, the narcissus does not occur in cult as their crown; no flower-crowns are used, they are even forbidden to the participants in the Thesmophoria; (2) positively, the cult uses crowns of ears of corn, of myrtle, and of smilax <sup>2</sup>). The authority for the last two plants is I. who supplied the evidence: for the myrtle he enumerated the cult-officials who wear the myrtle-crown (at the celebration of the mysteries?), and the smilax he mentioned as the object of *δικασία*. The scholion is <sup>25</sup> abridged, and it is therefore not quite certain that I. refers to the *διαδικασία* Κροκωνίδων πρὸς Κοιρωνίδας of F 3; 15 <sup>3</sup>). If he did the crown of smilax was the mark of distinction of a certain priest(ess), or was restricted to a certain ceremony which of course belonged to the cult of Demeter <sup>4</sup>). We do not know anything else about these matters, for Hesych. s.v. *σμίλος*· <sup>30</sup> δένδρον . . . ἄλλοι μίλακα ἢ στεφανοῦνται is excessively abbreviated; but the smilax and myrtle in the Messenian legend Pausan. 4, 26/7 corroborate the connexion with the goddess <sup>5</sup>). In any case, F 29 reads like an interpretation and would thus likely belong to the *Atakta*.

(30) Phot. Suda s.v. *μορία*· ἐλαίαι ἱεραὶ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς, ἐξ ὧν τὸ ἐλαιον <sup>35</sup> ἐπαθλον ἐδίδοτο τοῖς νικῶσι τὰ Παναθήναια. ἦσαν δὲ πρῶται ἰβ τὸν ἀριθμόν, αἰ μεταφυτευθεῖσαι ἐκ τῆς ἀκροπόλεως εἰς Ἀκαδημίαν, ἥτοι ἀπὸ τοῦ μέρου καὶ τοῦ φόνου τοῦ Ἀλιρροβίου ὀνομασθεῖσαι οὕτως, ἢ ὅτι ἐνέμοντο καὶ ἐμερίζοντο τὸ ἐλαιον τὸ ἐξ αὐτῶν Ἀθηναῖοι ἅπαντες. Et. M. p. 590, 42 (Reitzenstein *Griech. Etymologica* p. 165) *μορία*· ἢ ἐλαία. οἱ μὲν πᾶσαν ἐλαίαν οὕτω καλοῦσιν, οἱ δὲ



τὰς ἱεράς τῆι θεῶι <sup>1</sup>). ἐκλήθη δὲ μορία, <ὡς> οἱ μὲν, ὅτι δημοσίαν μοῖραν ἐκ τῶν καρπῶν ἐλάμβανον [Ζήνων δὲ ὁ Μύνδιος, ὅτι τὸ βρύον τῶν ἐλαιῶν ἐκαλεῖτο μόρον, ἔνθεν αἱ ἀνοῦσαι ἐλαΐαι μοριαὶ ἐλέγοντο]. τινὲς δὲ φασὶ διὰ τὸν ἐπὶ Ἀλιρροθίωι μῦθον, ὃς ἑαυτὸν ἀνεῖλεν πελέκει \* \* \* [βιασάμενον αὐτοῦ τῆν θυγατέρα Ἀλκίππην] <sup>2</sup>). ἀπὸ οὖν τοῦ περὶ αὐτοῦ μόρου, ὅτι ἀνηρέθη κόπτων τὰς ἐλαίας, μορία ἐκλήθη. Σέλευκος.

The verbatim quotation from I. has either dropped out entirely or is curtailed in its opening; the Suda has preserved the number of the μοριαὶ only. If the sentence with φασὶν is part of the excerpt from I. he 10 quoted authors and may have summarized the tradition with its numerous variants regarding the olive trees <sup>3</sup>) as he did on the Klepsydra (F 6). The same scholia on v. 698 cite Philochoros (F 125) and Androtion (F 39) for the fact that the Lacedaemonians spared the sacred olive trees in the Peloponnesian War, and both fragments derive from their Atthides, but 15 the mention of the Tetrapolis may point beyond them to the special book of Philochoros (328 F 73/5). If that citation is taken from I., and if it occurred in the same passage (which of course is not certain), I. may have enumerated all cases in which the Spartans spared Attic places during the Great War <sup>4</sup>), and his treatment must have been very detailed. He may 20 have dealt with the matter in the account of the strife of the gods for the country <sup>5</sup>) or in a detailed description of the Panathenaia; but a digression in the story of Theseus (which could easily be inserted in the passage about his relations with women: F 10 <sup>6</sup>)) seems even more obvious, and some remains of it are possibly preserved in Plutarch's 25 *Theseus* 32: (the Tyndarids set out against Athens and demand the extradition of Helen) ἀποκριναμένων δὲ τῶν ἐν ἄστει μῆτ' ἔχειν μῆτε γινώσκειν ὅπου καταλέλειπται, πρὸς πόλεμον ἐτρέποντο. φράζει δ' αὐτοῖς Ἀκάδημος ἡσιθη- μένος ὡς δὴ τινι τρόπῳ τὴν ἐν Ἀφίδναις κρύψιν αὐτῆς. ὅθεν ἐκείνῳ τε τιμαὶ 30 ζῶντι παρὰ τῶν Τυνδαριδῶν ἐγένοντο, καὶ π ο λ λ ά κ ι ς ὕστερον εἰς τὴν Ἀττι- κὴν ἐμβالόντες Λακεδαιμόνιοι καὶ πᾶσαν ὁμοῦ τὴν χώραν τέμνοντες τῆς Ἀκα- δημίας ἀπέιχοντο διὰ τὸν Ἀκάδημον. ὁ δὲ Δικαίαρχος Ἐχέμου φησὶ καὶ Μαρά- θου συστρατευσάντων τότε τοῖς Τυνδαρίδαις ἐξ Ἀρκαδίας, ἀφ' οὗ μὲν Ἐγεδη- μίαν προσαγορευθῆναι τὴν νῦν Ἀκαδημίαν, ἀφ' οὗ δὲ Μαραθῶνα τὸν δῆμον, ἐπιδόντος ἑαυτὸν ἑκουσίως κατὰ τι λόγιον σφαιγιάσασθαι πρὸ τῆς παρατάξεως. 35 (31) I. is cited in the second half of the scholion for the same opinion for which τινὲς are cited in the first half. It is therefore doubtful that the view of Pherekydes reached the Scholiast through I. and that Polemon polemized against the latter. Also it is uncertain whether Pausanias I, 39, 3 coincides with I: he accentuates the fact that παλαιστικὴν γὰρ τέχνην εὖρε

Θησεύς πρῶτος, καὶ πάλης κατέστη ὕστερον ἀπ' ἐκείνου διδασκαλία· πρότερον <δὲ> ἐχρῶντο μεγέθει μόνον καὶ βίωμῃ πρὸς τὰς πάλας, but he does not tell us where Theseus learnt the τέχνη and does not mention Athena. That may be negligence on the part of Pausanias, but considering the abundance of variants we shall have to be cautious. Phorbas no doubt is in Athens the hero of the Phorbanteion, which was situated not near the Theseion but on the market <sup>1</sup>). Whatever he was originally <sup>2</sup>), the earliest Atthidographer, Hellanikos 323 a F 3, already calls him son of Poseidon. We shall have to assume this to be the cult-legend, which also favours the supposition that of the two connexions into which Mythography brings Phorbas (*viz.* the war with Eleusis <sup>3</sup>) and comradeship with Theseus <sup>4</sup>)) the former is the earlier and comes nearer to the original nature of the hero. We cannot really distinguish two different figures, and parallels anyhow favour the opinion that the hero was only secondarily drawn into the sphere of Theseus, which takes shape as it were before our eyes borrowing or attracting material from all sides. We may regard it as a consequence that Phorbas the participant in the Erechtheus war has no fixed part in the sphere of Theseus: not to mention other details <sup>5</sup>) he is sometimes the paidotribes of Theseus, sometimes his charioteer. In the former quality he is the inventor of the πάλη, which Polemon records him to be; we should like to know whether this connexion with wrestling is an old trait, belonging to the nature of the obscure hero. When I. on the other hand makes Theseus the pupil of Athena and the teacher of Phorbas, the fact that one group of historians of culture prefers divine inventors is hardly a sufficient explanation of this version, for in the series Athena-Theseus-Phorbas the last link is superfluous and has evidently been included only because the notion of him as wrestler is earlier. It almost appears as if Theseus in this instance (as in other species of athletics) had superseded Phorbas, who was forced down to the rôle of his companion and even his servant <sup>6</sup>). We know nothing about the stages of the development (if development there was) and as little about the attitude of the Atthidographers; we therefore cannot tell whether I. had predecessors and who they were. The possible criticism of Polemon would not be a proof of I. having been the first to introduce Athena. The occasion for his mentioning Phorbas in the story of Theseus may have been either Theseus' victory over Kerkyon <sup>7</sup>) (narrated perhaps in the chapter about the women F 10) or the expedition to Crete <sup>8</sup>).

(32) Neither the facts nor the dates of Xenophon's exile and recall are certain <sup>1</sup>); also it is doubtful whether he made use of the permission to

return <sup>2)</sup>. We do not know anything about the movers either; even if I. s statement is correct (which, of course, it may be) the two persons need not have been the same <sup>3)</sup>. And it is quite impossible to determine in which of his many books or in what context I. mentioned Xenophon, 5 whether he did so *ex officio* or incidentally when enumerating such coincidences somewhere, say in the Σύμμικτα or Ὑπομνήματα. One might even think of the Πρὸς Τιμαίων ἀντιγραφαί (F 59), for Timaios liked to establish coincidences, and he did not always keep to the actual facts.

(33—38) These fragments are the remains of a complete Life of Sopho- 10 kles. They certainly do not come from the *Attika* or the book Περὶ μελοποιῶν (F 56), and hardly from the *Atakta* which probably discussed a number of passages of Sophokles. On the other hand, a special book Περὶ Σοφοκλέους is by no means impossible. The author of the preserved Life 15 Aristarchos', certainly used the book of I. directly besides Satyros and others. What I. gives is not better or worse than what we find in the average biographies of Hellenistic times about the classic authors for whose lives the sources were meagre: some information more or less anecdotic about their origin, conduct in life, manner of death, and 20 posthumous renown; some theatrical tradition about technical innovations <sup>2)</sup>; other statements which may be founded on wild interpretations of passages in the tragedies <sup>3)</sup>. The scanty parallel tradition is collected in O. Jahn *Sophoclis Electra* <sup>3</sup> 1882; the individual pieces of information are discussed (with no great result, as might be expected) by 25 von Blumenthal *RE* III A, 1927, col. 1040 ff. and W. Schmid *Gr. Lit.* II, 1934, p. 311 ff.; for F 38 see Ferguson *Harv. Theol. Rev.* 37, 1944, p. 86 ff.

(39) If we may form an idea of the contents of the *Argolika* from that of the *Attika*, and of its size according to that of the *Eliaka*, the scanty 30 use made of the book is surprising <sup>1)</sup>. The only fragment belongs to the primeval history of the country and deals with its old name *Apia* which the tragic poets applied to the Argolid <sup>2)</sup> because (following the earliest interpreters of Homer?) they found the usage in the epos <sup>3)</sup>. The name is either derived from an eponymous hero *Apis* or from one of the names 35 of the pear-tree <sup>4)</sup> which was held to be as typical for the Argolid as the olive was for Athens: ἄπιοι and ἀχράδες are the earliest food of the inhabitants <sup>5)</sup>; the oldest cult-image of Hera was made from the ὄγχνη or the ἀχράς <sup>6)</sup>. What exactly I. said is clear only in so far as the second explanation of the name of the country is the basis of both quotations:

according to Athenaios he derived the name from the *ἄπιοι*, according to Stephanos the *ἀχράδες* of the Argolid-*Apia* are called *ἄπιοι* ὑπὸ τῶν ἑξωθεν. The second quotation looks like the explanation of a gloss, but then *ἄπιοι* ought to be an indigenous word. It is so in Plutarch and Aelian, the latter distinguishing between Argive *ἄπιοι* and Tiryinthian *ἀχράδες*, the former stating a change of name from *ἀχράδες* to *ἄπιοι* 7). Perhaps the lack of clearness is due to the fact that we have only two brief sentences from a rather full discussion on the name *Ἀπία* for the country; but the words ὑπὸ τῶν ἑξωθεν in the article of Stephanos, which is corrupt in other parts, remain doubtful.

(40—42) The *Eliaka* was used by Didymos and by one of the authorities of Stephanos, who both here and in the ethnographic epics of Rhianos (no. 265) found many names of places, unknown or little known otherwise. It is quite possible that the scholia on Pindar contain more material from this work; but the conjectures of Wellmann p. 106 ff. yield few really certain facts.

(40) Et. M. p. 451, 48 Φύτειον πόλις ἀπὸ Φυτέως τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτήν. Suda s.v. Φύττειον· δνομα πόλεως. The town and the eponymous hero 1) are unknown. Luebbert *Ind. schol. Bonn.* 1881/2 p. 9 and Wellmann p. 111 find the name in Schol. Pindar. *Ol.* 10, 46 ἐὰν πόλιν] τὴν πόλιν δὲ καλεῖσθαι φασι (BC φηοὶ καλ. DEQ) Φύκτεον (BC πύκτεον E φυκτέαν DQ<sup>ac</sup>) ἀπὸ τίνος Φυκτέως, οὗ μέμνηται καὶ Ἡσίοδος (F 73 Rz<sup>3</sup>) «τὴν δ' Ἀμαρυγκείδης Ἰππόστρατος, ὄζος Ἄρηος, / Φυκτέος (Heinsius — τεως B — τεὺς CEQ) ἀγλαδὸς υἱός, Ἐπειῶν ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν». But Pindar is talking of the town of Augeias which is called Elis in the prose narratives 2), and we do not see how this town is connected with Φυ(κ)τεὺς; the name of Augeias' son is Φυλεύς. Hesiod, it is true, calls his Φυκτεὺς like Augeias chief of the Epeans, but he certainly narrated something quite different. Perhaps the resemblance of Ἐπειῶν ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν with Ἐπειῶν βασιλεύς (Pindar) was the only link for the interpreters (who are the subject of φασί) when they were looking for a name of the town which was anonymous in Pindar. The town possibly belongs to the share of Augeias' ally Amarynkeus, as the passage in Hesiod is about an Ἀμαρυγκείδης 3). We cannot alter the text of Stephanos, for the alphabetical order makes Φύτειον certain. As long as the problem of the name has not been solved we cannot tell whether I. treated Herakles in Elis as late as the fourth book, and whether he discussed here the tradition which regarded Herakles as the founder of the cult in Olympia. F 42 yields the fact that I. narrated the war with Augeias, but in that fragment the number of the book is lacking.

(41) See Wilamowitz *Ph. U.* 9, 1886, p. 175 f.; Wellmann p. 108 ff.; Ernst Meyer *R E* XIX 2, 1938, col. 1594 f. who because of F 42 assumes Echephyllidas to be the source of I. Unfortunately we cannot tell in what context I. mentioned Phaisana, but he certainly did mention the tomb of 5 Aipytos, which Pausan. 8, 16, 2 describes.

(42) I am no longer so certain that we can gain anything for I. from the learned scholion, even if it derives from Didymos (Περὶ παροιμιῶν<sup>1</sup>). It is uncertain (at least in regard to the middle section) which of the authors cited explained the proverb and whose account of the adventures of 10 Herakles the paroimiographers used when looking for an explanation. Since the time of Echephyllidas cannot be determined by his fragments there is no foundation for supposing that I. quoted him. And how are we to understand the statement that Pherekydes (who was certainly much 15 earlier) 'says the same' as Echephyllidas, if both quotations are said to be taken from I.? Consequently it is credible that Didymos cited I.; it is possible that I. cited Pherekydes for the fight of Herakles with the Molionids and Komarchos for some special trait, perhaps (if that author wrote *Eliaka*) for the locality 'Hδδ ὄδωρ; it is improbable that Didymos 20 found Echephyllidas in I. We cannot decide whether he took the other explanations or narratives from an intermediate source or from Hellanikos, Herodoros, Duris themselves, authors who were still read at the time of Didymos.

(43—46) The idea repeatedly put forward that these four fragments come from a digression in the *Atthis*<sup>1</sup>) lacks probability: the citations 25 point to a special book; I., who lived in Egypt, wrote a separate book also about the town Ptolemais (F 47). The 'Αποικίαι was not restricted in its contents to the relations between Sais and Athens, a topic on which the Atthidographers contradicted the Egyptomaniacs<sup>2</sup>): it comprehended 30 the connexions between Egypt on the one hand and probably all other countries (not only Hellas) on the other, but (as far as we see and as is natural) only in mythical times. Before I. Hekataios of Abdera in his *Aigyptiaka*<sup>3</sup>) had argued (probably as the first) that not only were the Egyptians the oldest people, but also that the valley of the Nile was the birth-place of mankind, and that consequently all other peoples and 35 towns were emigrants and colonies of Egypt. It seems probable that I. took this historical digression as his point of departure; we may assume that he developed it in detail and that he collected all material suitable for supporting the thesis. Of the four fragments three seem to refer to the Argive sphere. It is regrettable that nothing about Athens is preserved.

(43) Io-Isis as the daughter of Prometheus is surprising at first sight only; the equation is certainly not merely due to a 'confusion with Phoroneus, the Egyptian Prometheus' <sup>1)</sup>. Identifications and combinations of this kind appear as an outcome of Greek-Egyptian syncretism in the early Hellenistic period; only part of them are due to religious speculation, but they often use local claims of Greek towns. The Argives laid claim to the tomb of Prometheus, although they asserted on the other hand that not he but Phoroneus was the giver of fire <sup>2)</sup>. We find Isis, whom Kallimachos equates with Io as a matter of course <sup>3)</sup>, as the daughter of Prometheus and the wife of (Osiris)-Dionysos as early as in Antikleides of Athens, an author of the time of the Diadochs <sup>4)</sup>. The "Έλληνες of Diodoros transfer the birth of Isis-Io to Argos <sup>5)</sup>; the tale, which he combines with the theology of Hekataios of Abdera, knows Prometheus as being the έπιμελητής of a part of Egypt <sup>6)</sup>. We cannot make out the origin, the development, and the ramifications of the individual inventions, but what was said about Prometheus and Io is, of course, connected with the arguments attempting to prove that Argos was an Egyptian colony even before the arrival of Danaos. We may judge the value of these arguments from Hekataios' proof for the Egyptian character of Athens <sup>7)</sup>: these matters must not be taken seriously, but on the other hand they must not be interpreted away.

(44) The eponym Aigialeus is λόγωι μὲν τῶι Σικυωνίων the first king of Sikyon <sup>1)</sup> and αὐτόχθων <sup>2)</sup>; his fourth descendant is Apis. We do not know what connexions I. made out with Egypt, but Apis is an 'Egyptian' name and is generally associated with Egypt: *Bibl.* 2,2 Ἄπις . . . ἄπαις ἀπέθανε, καὶ νομισθεὶς θεὸς ἐκλήθη Σάραπις; cf. Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1, 106, 4 Ἄπις τε ὁ Ἄργου βασιλεὺς Μέμφιν οἰκίζει, ὡς φησὶν Ἄριστιππος ἐν πρώτῃ Ἀρχαδικῶν (317 F 1) τοῦτον δὲ Ἄριστέας ὁ Ἄργεῖος (VI) ἐπονομασθῆναί φησι Σάραπιν, καὶ τοῦτον εἶναι ὃν Αἰγύπτιοι σέβουσιν. The converse line of thought <sup>3)</sup> is represented by Suda s.v. Ἄπις· ὅτι ὁ Ἄπις ὁ Αἰγύπτιος τὴν ἰατρικὴν πρῶτος εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα μετακομίσει λέγεται. Is the same the case with Porphyry. *De abst.* 3, 15 Ἄπις δὲ λέγεται πρῶτος νομοθετῆσαι παρ' Ἑλλήνων, ὅτε ἐδεήθησαν?

(45) We cannot determine the chronological relation between the two books by disciples of Kallimachos. The eponym Kypros does not occur in the pedigrees Schol. Dionys. Per. 509 and *Bibl.* 3, 181/2 although the latter knows besides two sons of Kinyras <sup>1)</sup> (Oxyporos and Adonis) three daughters who διὰ μῆνιν Ἀφροδίτης ἄλλοτρίους ἀνδράσι συνευναζόμεναι τὸν βίον ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ μετέλλαξαν. On the other hand there is evidence for Egyptians

(or Aethiopians) in Kypros: (1) Herodt. 7, 90 τούτων δὲ τοσάδε ἔθνεά ἐστι· οἱ μὲν ἀπὸ Σαλαμῖνος καὶ Ἀθηνῶων, οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ Ἀρκαδίας, οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ Κύθνου, οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ Φοινίκης, οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ Αἰθιοπίας, ὡς αὐτοὶ Κύπριοι λέγουσι. (2) Serv. Dan. Verg. Buc. 10, 18 *est etiam alter ordo huius fabulae* (about Adonis) *ex Aegypto* † *Epirotasterius et Yon fratres ad insulam Cyprum projecti sunt atque ibi sortiti uxores, ex quorum genere Celes procreatus est, qui habuit Erinonam filiam e.q.s.* Schol. Dion. Per. 509 Κεραστὴν αὐτὴν καλουμένην ὠκίσηεν θυλὸς Αἰγύπτου, οὗ υἱὸς Κέλτης<sup>2)</sup> ἄπαις τελευτᾷ. (3) Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀμαθούς· πόλις Κύπρου ἀρχαιοτάτη, ἐν ἧι Ἀδωνίς Ὀσσηρις ἐτιμᾶτο, ὃν  
 10 Αἰγύπτιον ὄντα Κύπριοι καὶ Φοίνικες ἰδιοποιοῦνται<sup>3)</sup>.

(46) Perhaps this fragment derives from a catalogue of the daughters of Danaos who became mothers or wives of founders of Peloponnesian towns, thus proved to be at least half-Egyptian. Anaxithea is otherwise unknown<sup>1)</sup>; Rufin. *Recogn.* 1, 10 (who supplies more particulars)<sup>2)</sup>  
 15 mentions in her stead Hippodameia, who in *Bibl.* 2, 17 is the wife of Istros or Diokorystes. The variants may indicate late invention in local literature; the point of departure was perhaps the narrative in Hygin. *Astr.* 2, 13, which is rich in variants about Olenos, son of Hephaistos and father of Aiga and Helike, the nurses of Zeus<sup>3)</sup>.

(47) The fragment is evidently part of an inventory of a temple or of an enumeration of dedicatory gifts (made by Philopator?). The work, which comprised at least two books, was certainly not a *Ptolemais*, but  
 20 contained a detailed description of the Greek town in upper Egypt founded by Ptolemaios Soter, and Siebelis restored the title accord-  
 25 ingly<sup>1)</sup>. If the assumption of Plaumann<sup>2)</sup> is correct that Ptolemaios Philopator developed the cult of the founder into a 'cult of the empire' we shall have to connect the composition of I.s book with these events, without inferring personal connexions of the author (who after all was probably living in Alexandria) with *Ptolemais*<sup>3)</sup>. The book may very  
 30 well have been designed for official (or semi-official) propaganda.

(48) Immisch<sup>1)</sup> established the notion that the alleged sacrifice of children for Kronos was a 'learned interpretation of the war-dance round a child' more succinctly but perhaps more convincingly than Pohlenz<sup>2)</sup>, and a general reference to rituals of initiation<sup>3)</sup> seems apt to support it.  
 35 Apart from that we are rather helpless in face of such isolated pieces of information as F 48 presents, and I at least do not see that the account of Antikleides (I40 F 7) about human sacrifices for Zeus in Lyktos contributes to an explanation of I.s report.

(49) Schol. Pindar *Ol.* 7, 36c ἔστι δὲ αὐτοῦ (*scil.* Τληπολέμου) ἱερὸν καὶ τάφος

ἐν Ῥόδῳ· οἱ γὰρ συστρατευσάμενοι αὐτῷ διήγαγον τὰ ὄσα ἀπὸ τῆς Ἥλιου εἰς  
 τὴν Ῥόδον . . . . τελεῖται δὲ καὶ ἀγὼν ἐπιτάφιος ἐν τῇ πόλει Τληπολέμου, κατὰ  
 δὲ ἑτέροισι ἱερῶς Ἥλιου· ἀγωνίζονται δὲ παῖδων ἡλικίαι, καὶ στέφονται ἐκ λεύ-  
 κης. Tzetz. Lykophr. 911 ἐν δὲ Πινδάρου ἱστορίαις εὖρον ὅτι οἱ τοῦ Τληπο-  
 5 λέμου ἐσώθησαν εἰς Ῥόδον . . . καὶ ἡ γυνὴ Τληπολέμου Φιλοζώη<sup>1</sup>) . . . ἀγῶνας  
 ἐπὶ ταῖς ταύτης ἀνδρὶ ἔθετο, καὶ παῖδες ἠγωνίζοντο, καὶ οἱ νικῶντες λεύκης φύλλοις  
 ἐστέφοντο. I. may have written the two or three books Περὶ τῶν Ἥλιου  
 ἀγῶνων, Περὶ στεφάνων (F 54) and Περὶ ἰδιότητος ἔθλων (F 55)<sup>2</sup>) as sup-  
 10 plements to Kallimachos' Περὶ ἀγῶνων<sup>3</sup>). The literature about agones was  
 considerable already at the time of I. His words (if they are a verbatim  
 quotation) seem to be part of an enumeration; they are not sound, and  
 they yield very little. It is possible that the Scholiast brought him in only  
 on the basis of a wrong inference: in a book about agones for Helios, even  
 if it was confined to Rhodes, I. hardly had occasion to speak about  
 15 Tlepolemeia. The existence of the latter has recently been attested for  
 the second century B.C. by the honorary decree for Χερσονάσιος Ὀνασι-  
 τέλης, who won παῖδας καὶ ἐφήβους Τλαπολέμεια<sup>4</sup>); it therefore certainly  
 existed in Pindar's time too, and was arranged for παῖδες, for the poet  
 mentions this victory of Diagoras in the first place. The Helieia, with  
 20 which alone the words of I. are concerned, were not so restricted.

(50—53) The quotations, especially F 50, seem to forbid the suggestion  
 of a collective work Ἐπιφάνειαι<sup>1</sup>), nor do the parallels favour it: in the  
 third century B.C. Phylarchos wrote Περὶ τῆς τοῦ Διὸς ἐπιφανείας<sup>2</sup>), and  
 Syriskos of the Pontic Chersonnesos τὰς ἐπιφανείας τὰς Παρθένου φιλοπό-  
 25 νως συγγράφιας ἀνέγνω<sup>3</sup>); in 99 B.C. the Lindians voted, on the motion of  
 Timachidas, to record ἃ καὶ ἡ ἀρμόζοντα περὶ τῶν ἀναθεμάτων καὶ τὰς ἐπιφα-  
 νείας τῆς θεοῦ, and the fourth part of the inscription, which carries the  
 title Ἐπιφάνειαι, records cases from the opening of the fifth century down  
 to at least 305/4 B.C. (no. 532). The formula ἐπιστᾶσα καθ' ὕπνον τῷ δεῖναι is  
 30 decisive for visible appearance against mere manifestation of divine  
 power<sup>4</sup>); that is the true meaning of the word also when the epithet  
 Epiphanes is bestowed upon a Hellenistic sovereign<sup>5</sup>); and the same  
 applies to the many cases of ἐπιφάνειαι known to us which even in  
 Hellenistic times led to the institution of new cults<sup>6</sup>). What remains of  
 35 I.'s book is not sufficient to decide whether he was seriously interested in  
 religion, collecting also these new instances, or whether he restricted  
 himself to the learned discussion arising from, or connected with, earlier  
 ἐπιφάνειαι.

(50) The composition of Harpokration's abbreviated article is lucid<sup>1</sup>).



It contains (1) a description of the Attic ritual at the Thargelia (δύο ἄνδρες Ἀθήνησιν ἐξήγον κτλ.); (2) an aition of τὰ τοῖς Θαργηλοῖς ἀγομένα taken from I.s work about the Ἀπόλλωνος ἐπιφάνεια; (3) a note about the accentuation of φαρμακός (Δίδυμος προπερισπᾶν ἀξιοῖ τοῦνομα) which M. Schmidt *Didymi Fragm.* p. 314 explained by referring to Phot. *Lex.* s.v. φαρμακός· τὸ κάθαρμα· βραχέως· οἱ δὲ Ἴωνες ἐκτείνοντες λέγουσι φαρμάκον κτλ. Probably Didymos also furnished the lexicographer with the excerpt from I. In it the locality, the persons, the singular number φαρμακός, the stoning, show that I. does not describe the Attic ritual, for the aition would not explain the Athenian ritual, no matter whether δύο ἄνδρες or ἄνθρωπος καὶ γυνή<sup>2)</sup> were used there for the purification of the town. The derivation of φαρμακός from a man called Φαρμακός is possible only for a place which used one scape-goat<sup>3)</sup>, and we do not know where that was<sup>4)</sup>: there is evidence of the Thargelia and of expiatory rituals in many, particularly in Ionian, towns<sup>5)</sup>. The authority for the preceding description of the Attic ritual has dropped out of the text of Harpokration, and we are not in a position to supply it. Nothing tells in favour of I.; Harpokration's mode of citing may rather be said to tell against him. The most likely source is a book *Περὶ ἑορτῶν*, e.g. that of Philochoros quoted twice in Harpokration<sup>6)</sup>, though an *Atthis* would also be possible. Whatever the source, for Athens we expect an Attic aition, something like the detailed parallel to Harpokration's first section preserved in Helladios' *Chrestomathy*<sup>7)</sup> who presumably excerpted the same source: 25 ἔτι ἔθος ἦν ἐν Ἀθήναις φαρμακοῦς ἄγειν δύο, τὸν μὲν ὑπὲρ ἀνδρῶν, τὸν δὲ ὑπὲρ γυναικῶν πρὸς τὸν καθαρμὸν ἀγομένου. καὶ ὁ μὲν τῶν ἀνδρῶν μελαινας ἰσχάδας περὶ τὸν τράχηλον εἶχε, λευκὰς δ' ἄτερος· σὺβάκχοι δὲ, φησὶν, ὠνομάζοντο. τὸ δὲ καθάρισον τοῦτο λοιμικῶν νόσων ἀποτροπιασμός ἦν, λαβὼν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπὸ Ἀνδρόγεω τοῦ Κρητός, οὗ τεθνηκότος ἐν ταῖς Ἀθήναις παρανόμως τὴν λοιμικὴν ἐνόσησαν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι νόσον, καὶ ἐκράτει τὸ ἔθος αἰεὶ καθαίρειν 30 τὴν πλὴν τοῖς φαρμακοῖς<sup>8)</sup>).

(51) Theognost. *Cramer A.O.* II 103, II τρίττοια, ἢ θυσία, ἥτις ἐκ τριῶν ζώων ἐθύετο, ἢ ὅτι τριετῆ ἦν τὰ θυόμενα. Schol. Aristoph. *Plut.* 819 (Suda s.v. τριττός) ἐντελής δὲ θυσία ἢ ἐξ ὕδός, τράγου, κριοῦ, ἢν καλοῦσι τριττύν. Hesych. s.v. τρικτύα· τριάδα· ἔνιοι θυσία κάπρου, κριοῦ, ταύρου. 35 *Id.* s.v. τρικτεῖρα· θυσία Ἐνναλίωι· θύεται δὲ πάντα τρία καὶ ἑνορχα. Eustath. *Od.* λ 130 ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι ἡ τοιαύτη θυσία τριττύα λέγεται παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς, οἱ τριττῶν ἔλεγον τὴν ἐκ τριῶν ζώων θυσίαν, οἷον δύο μῆλων καὶ βοός, ὡς Ἐπίχαρμος (F 187 Kaibel), ἢ βοός καὶ αἰγός καὶ προβάτου, ἢ κάπρου καὶ κριοῦ καὶ ταύρου. ἢ δὲ τοιαύτη καὶ βουπρωρός φασιν ἐλέγετο διὰ τὸ

προηγείσθαι αὐτῆς οἷα νηὸς πρῶραν τὸν βοῦν. Schol BT Hom. II. T 197 πρὸς δὲ τὰ δρῆα τρισὶν ἐχρῶντο Ἀττικοί, κάπρωι, κριῶι, ταῦρωι. Eustath. *Od.* α. 399 Παιουσανίας (F 56 Schw.) δὲ λέγων . . . καὶ ὅτι Ἀνάκεια ἐορτὴ Διοσκουρίου ἀνακοῖν ὡς σοφοῖν. τριττυίαν δὲ φησι τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην εἶναι συμβαίνει, Διοσκουρίοι καὶ Ἑλένη, δι' ἣν εἰς τὴν Ἀττικὴν ἐμβαλόντες ἐκείνοι οὐκ ἠδίκησαν οὐδένα τῶν ἐγγχωρίων. On this form of sacrifice see Stengel *Opferbräuche*, 1910, p. 82; 92; 195; *Kultusaltertümer*<sup>2</sup> p. 122; Eitrem *Beiträge* II, 1917, p. 12 f.; and particularly Ziehen *RE* VII A 1, 1939, col. 338 ff.; XVIII 1, 1939, col. 596, 45 ff. (but even he does not pay sufficient  
 10 attention to the last two passages adduced above). Unfortunately the brevity and incompleteness of the tattered excerpts make it impossible to recognize whether I. was correcting Kallimachos or (rather) describing the ritual of a certain (Attic?) cult. The excerpt of Photios does not compel us to assume that I. proposed an etymology of the τριττοία  
 15 different from the general conception which correctly derived the name from the number three of the animals sacrificed; but Theognostos makes it probable that he did. A third etymology is found in the Atticist Pausanias, who derived the name from the three recipients of the sacrifice; this explanation belongs to the story of Theseus, or of the Tetrapolis, and  
 20 the author of it surely was an Atthidographer whom unfortunately we cannot identify.

(52) It is not impossible that the whole of chapter 14, a proof complete in itself that the flute as well as the lyre belongs to Apollo, derives from I. He seems to have quoted Antikleides<sup>1)</sup>, and we can well attribute to the  
 25 author of the *Μελοποιοί* (F 56) the subsequent citations of Alkaios, Alkman, and Korinna. Pausanias<sup>2)</sup> gives the names of the artists Angelion and Tektaios, which seem not to have occurred in I.<sup>3)</sup>

(53) The Ms. S represents 'an earlier and much better tradition of the B-class' of Zenobios' *Proverbia* (Cohn). About the quotations of authors  
 30 in the third book see Crusius *Anal. crit. ad Paroemiogr. Graecos*, 1883, p. 81 ff. In the explanation the statement of the place has unfortunately dropped out; the nearest parallel is ἡ ἐν Κύπρωι παρακώπτουσα ἐτι νῦν προσ-αγορευομένη<sup>1)</sup>.

(54) Siebelis supposed that Conti invented the title of this book after  
 35 F 29. Though the fact is first found in Lucian *Anach.* 9 (τὰ δὲ ἄθλα τίνα ὑμῖν ταῦτά ἐστιν; — Ὀλυμπίασι μὲν στέφανος ἐκ κοτίνου, Ἴσθμοῖ δὲ ἐκ πίτυος, ἐν Νεμέαι δὲ σελίνων πεπλεγμένος, Πυθοῖ δὲ μῆλα τῶν ἱερῶν τοῦ θεοῦ<sup>1)</sup>) we cannot entirely reject the possibility that it was recorded already by I., e.g. in *Περὶ ἰδιότητος ἄθλων*; writers began at a very early date

to discuss the crowning of the victors <sup>3)</sup>. If there is any truth in the fact Krappe *Cl. Ph.* 37, 1942, p. 353 ff. ought to welcome I.s testimony as corroborating his hypothesis of the Nordic 'Apollo of the apple-tree'.

(55) Aelian. *V. H.* 10, 2 Εὐβάταν τὸν Κυρηναῖον<sup>1)</sup> ἰδοῦσα Λαῖς ἠράσθη αὐτοῦ  
 5 θερμότατα, καὶ περὶ γάμου λόγους προσήνεγκεν· ὁ δὲ φοβηθεὶς τὴν ἐξ αὐτῆς ἐπι-  
 βουλὴν ὑπέσχετο ταῦτα δράσειν. οὐ μὴν ὠμίλησεν αὐτῇ ὁ Εὐβάτας σωφρόνας  
 διαβιάσας, ἡ δὲ ὑπέσχεσις αὐτοῦ μετὰ τὴν ἀγωνίαν ἦν. νικήσας οὖν ἵνα μὴ  
 δόξει διαφθεῖραι τὰς ὁμολογίας τὰς πρὸς τὴν ἀνθρωπον, εἰκόνα γραψάμενος  
 τῆς Λαίδος ἐς τὴν Κυρήνην ἐκόμισε, λέγων ἔχειν Λαίδα καὶ μὴ παραβῆναι τὰς  
 10 συνθήκας· ἀνθ' ὧν ἡ γυνὴ ἡ νόμῳ γημαμένη αὐτῷ παμμέγιστον ἀνδριάντα  
 ἐν Κυρήνῃ ἀνέστησεν, αὐτὸν ἀμειβομένη τῆς σωφροσύνης. As the ab-  
 breviated narrative of Clement shows a slight difference from Aelian <sup>2)</sup>  
 we had better not alter the name Aristoteles which is also attested in  
 Kyrene, although the man is not known otherwise. The anecdote may  
 15 have been invented in order to explain the παμμέγιστος ἀνδριάς, and  
 repeated in books on Kyrene and on gymnastics as well. Parts of a section  
 dealing with continence during training are preserved in both Clement  
 and Aelian <sup>3)</sup>. It is doubtful whether we may assign to I. more than what  
 Clement cited under his name; the source may have quoted I. for the  
 20 Cyrenaean story because of the variant in the name. We cannot determine  
 the contents of I.s book by the one fragment, but taken together with  
 the somewhat vague title it seems to point to a compilation of peculiar-  
 ities not of the ἀγῶνες (these being assigned to the books Περὶ ἀγῶνων) but  
 of athletic training. Perhaps something about the prizes was mentioned  
 25 in this context <sup>4)</sup>.

(56) About the Μελοποιοί see above p. 618, 23 ff. and on F 52; about I.  
 as a biographer see *RE IX* col. 2279 f. A biographer quotes him, and  
 doubts his statements in the same way as in the biography of Sophokles  
 F 33/4. The alteration of Καλλίου to Καλλιμάχου is excellent: 480/79.  
 30 456/6, 412/1 B.C. are no Panathenaic years, and 406/5 B.C. is too late  
 for the first appearance of Phrynis in Athens; the year 446/5 B.C. accords  
 well with the date for Terpander in the Parian Marble <sup>1)</sup>.

(57) Siebelis and his successors wrongly assigned this fragment to the  
*Attika*; there is no reason to doubt the Σύμμικτα. I am somewhat doubtful  
 35 about my former idea that they were 'miscellaneous poems' <sup>1)</sup>: F 57  
 resembles F 58, and it may have discussed a Homeric problem, perhaps  
*Il. A* 97 f. πρὶν γ' ἀπὸ πατρὶ φίλῳ δόμεναι ἐλικώπιδα κούρην, / ἀπριάτην, ἀνάποι-  
 νον, ἄγειν θ' ἱερὴν ἑκατόμβην / ἐς Χρῦσσην. Schol. A(T) comment: ἐπὶ οὐ κατὰ  
 προσηγορίαν τὴν Ἀπριάτην (thus the word must be written) λέγει, ἀλλ' ἀντὶ

τοῦ ἀπρατί, καὶ παράλληλον τὸ ἀνάποιον· τὸ γὰρ αὐτὸ δι' ἀμφοτέρων δηλοῦται. διασταλατέον δὲ βραχὺ ἀπριάτην, ἀνάποιον, στικτέον δ' ἐς Χρύσην, ἐπεὶ κοινὸν κατὰ πάντων τὸ πρίν. τὸ ἀπριάτην ἐπιρρηματικῶς ἀκούει Ἀπολλώνιος ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀπριάδην. Apollonios certainly is the Rhodian<sup>2</sup>); the problem  
 5 was old, like most of this kind; the view rejected by Apollonios may have assumed Apriate to be the proper name of Χρυσή(ς<sup>3</sup>). Parthenios *Narr. am.* 26 told the story of the love of Trambelos for the Lesbian Apriate following the *Thrax* of Euphorion (F 23 Scheidw.); to this tale he added from Aristokritos ἐν τοῖς περὶ Μιλήτου (493 F 2) the death of Trambelos  
 10 by the hand of Achilles who ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμόνος μέγα χῶμα ἔχωσε for him as his relative; τοῦτο ἔτι νῦν ἠρώϊον (ἠρίον Meineke) Τραμβήλου καλεῖται. This monument is in Lesbos. I. told the whole story of Trambelos<sup>4</sup>), starting from the first capture of Troy when Telamon obtained Theaneira<sup>5</sup>) with whom he begot Trambelos<sup>6</sup>) down to the death of the latter. He locates  
 15 the death at Miletos like Aristobulos ( 139 F 6), who calls Trambelos Λελέγων βασιλεύς, mentioning the κρήνη Ἀχιλλεῖος καλουμένη in which Achilles purified himself after having slain Trambelos. An author who gave this account presumably rejected (like Apollonios) the interpretation of ἀπριάτην as the name of Chryseis. In any case, the story of  
 20 Trambelos was repeatedly treated during the third century, so that a detailed discussion in the Σύμμικτα appears conceivable.

(58) This fragment manifestly deals with a Homeric problem: some interpreters understood the words of Aias as an insult to the virgin goddess, others explained them ἀφ' ἱστορίας, *i.e.* they based their explan-  
 25 ation on the legend found in Tragedy since Aischylos F 175 N<sup>2</sup>, that Odysseus was the son of Antikleia by Sisyphos<sup>1</sup>) born before her marriage, and on the assumption of a town Al(al)komenai on Ithaka<sup>2</sup>) which they connect somehow with the famous cult of Athena Alalkomeneis in Boeotia<sup>3</sup>). I. connected the two facts by recording that the Boeotian  
 30 Athena took charge of the child exposed in, or near, her temple (evidently Lykophron *Alex.* 786 f. did the same), and that Odysseus proved his gratitude by naming (or re-naming) one of his towns from her epithet.

(59) *RE IX* col. 2278. It is regrettable that we know nothing whatever of this book.

35 (60) The fragment contains a 'fact' of natural science. Further information about these birds is found in *N. A.* 4, 42 (ὄσοι δὲ ἄρα αἰδοῦνται τὸ θεῖον καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον τὴν Ἄρτεμιν, οὐκ ἂν ποτε τῶνδε τῶν ὄρνιθων ἐπὶ τροφῇ προσάψαιντο) who refers for the reason to οἱ τὴν νῆσον οἰκοῦντες τὴν Λέρον. The only writer about Leros known to us is the Hellenistic mythographer

Pherekydes (no. 475). We cannot determine his time accurately, and the question must remain open whether Aelian means us to understand by his last words (καὶ ἔνεστι μαθεῖν ἀλλαχόθεν) that he takes the local tradition from an intermediate source; this might be I., whom he quoted here for the μελεαγρίδες. I. may have discussed them (I suggest this as a mere possibility) in connexion with the ζήτημα on *Il.* I 584 where Aristarchos read κασιγνήται καὶ πότνια μήτηρ, others κασιγνήτοι, interpreting the word either as 'brothers' or συλληπτικῶς as 'brothers and sisters' <sup>1)</sup>).

10 (61) Praxiphanes in his dialogue *Περὶ Ἱστορίας* <sup>1)</sup> either gave some account of Choirilos at the court of Archelaos or introduced him as a speaker.

(62) *Il.* Σ 552 ff. δράγματα δ' ἄλλα μετ' ὄγμον ἐπήτριμα πίπτον ἔραζε, | ἄλλα δ' ἀμαλλοδετῆρες ἐν ἑλλεδανοῖσι δέοντο. | τρεῖς δ' ἄρ' ἀμαλλοδετῆρες ἐφέστασαν, 15 αὐτὰρ ὅπισθε | παῖδες δραγμαεῦντες, ἐν ἀγκαλίδεσσιν φέροντες, | ἀσπερχὲς πάρεχον. Theokrit. 10, 44 σφίγγετ' ἀμαλλοδέται τὰ δράγματα. Kallim. *Hy. Cer.* 19 ff. κάλλιον, ὡς καλάμαν τε καὶ ἱερά δράγματα πράτα | ἀσταχῶν ἀπέκοψε καὶ ἐν βόας ἤκε πατῆσαι, | ἄνικα Τριπτόλεμος ἀγαθὰν ἐδιδάσκετο τέχνην. Anon. Atticist. p. 393. 11 Reitzenstein ἀμάλας <λέγουσιν Ἀττικῶς>, οὐ δράγματα <sup>1)</sup>. 20 Schol. Theokrit. 10, 44a ἀμάλη δὲ συνέστηκεν ἐκ δραγμάτων ῥ ἦ καὶ σ, δράγματα δὲ εἰσὶν ὅσα ὁ θερίζων λαμβάνει ἐν τῇ ἀριστεραῖ χειρὶ, παρὰ τὸ δράττειν. Eust. *Il.* Σ 553 p. 1162, 26 ἀμαλλοδετῆρες δὲ οἱ τὰς ἀμάλας δεσμοῦντες. ἀμάλλη δὲ τὸ ὑπ' ἀγκάλῃ συμπίεσμα τῶν δραγμάτων <sup>2)</sup>. . . . ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς ἀμάλλης καὶ Δημήτηρ Ἀμαλλοφόρος, ἦ ἔθυσον Ἀθηναῖοι. <sup>3)</sup> The 25 fragment is probably taken from the Ἀττικαὶ λέξεις, but the *Attika* or the *Atakla* is not impossible <sup>4)</sup>.

(63) Neither the attempt at connecting this gloss with the preceding one Σικελὸς στρατιώτης nor the supposition that σίκεον is a corruption of σίκερα is convincing.

30 (64—66) It is quite uncertain whether F 65 is taken from the *Attika* <sup>1)</sup>. For F 64 <sup>2)</sup> and 66 Siebelis suggested the Ἀπόλλωνος Ἐπιφάνεια. Perhaps one might think of the poetic works of I. <sup>3)</sup> for all three.

(67) The distant relationship of Phineus with Erechtheus through Oreithyia ~ Boreas — Kleopatra ~ Phineus is hardly a sufficient reason 35 for assigning F 67 to the *Attika* <sup>1)</sup>. The version which I. supplies of the blinding of Phineus is unique (at least for us) <sup>2)</sup> and (if it was he who replaced Poseidon by Helios) well considered. In view of F 64 (where I. differed from Kallimachos) it is regrettable that we cannot say whether I. handled the myth as an antiquary or as a poet.

(68) The rather curious quotation of an Ἴστρος τις, which interrupts the context of this scholion, belongs to the brief discussion of the questions concerning the Hellespont, copied by Eustathios on v. 135 ff. It is difficult to say whether I.s thesis has any connexion with the theories of the scientists about an irruption of the Pontos εἰς τὴν Προποντίδα καὶ τὸν Ἑλλάσποντον<sup>1)</sup>, and whether he touched upon them when dealing with the Argonauts. He cannot have been thinking of the σεισμοὶ καὶ κατακλυσμοὶ which according to Plato *Tim.* 25 CD caused the destruction of Atlantis: these happened in the outer ocean beyond the Oikumene, and they have never been accepted into the series of κατακλυσμοὶ which seems to be late anyhow. Censorin. *De d. nat.* 21 knows two, the 'earlier' one of Ogygos and that of Deukalion; Nonnos Dion. 3, 204 ff., with whom Usener<sup>2)</sup> grouped I., adds καὶ τρίτατος Διὸς δμβρος, ὅτε χθονὸς ἔκλυσεν ἔδρην | καὶ σκοπέλους ἔκρυψεν, Ἀθωιάδος δὲ καὶ αὐτῆς | ἄβροχα Σιθονίης ἐκαλύπτετο νῶτα κολώνης, | ὑψιπόρου τότε χεῦμα διασχίζων νιφετοῖο | Δάρδανος ἀρχαίης ἐπεβήσατο γείτονος Ἰδης.

(69) The conception of I. was the earlier and, before Aristarchos, perhaps the general one<sup>1)</sup>. It is also the right one at least for the *Iliad*, but we cannot discuss here the facts of the case<sup>2)</sup>.

(70) I. seems to have drawn a wrong inference as to the custom of the Homeric time from an isolated case; cf. *JHSI* 64, 1946, p. 42 n. 19.

(71) Chrestomathy *P. Ox.* 1241 col. 4, 10<sup>1)</sup> ὄπλα δὲ πολεμικὰ κατασκευάσασθαι λέγουσιν οἱ μὲν Ἄρη, τινὲς δὲ Κύκλωπας ἐν τῷ ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ σπη[λαι]ῳ ἃ καλεῖται Τεύχιον (P<sup>o</sup> τέχχιον οἱ τέκλιον P). ὀπλίσαι δὲ πρῶτον τεύχεσιν Βριάρεων, τῶν πρότε[ρον] ἀνθρώπων δοραῖς τὸ σῶμα σκεπαζόντων<sup>2)</sup>· ὡς δέ τινες ἱστοροῦσιν Ἄρη. ἄλλοι δὲ φασιν ὄπλα πρῶτον ἀρήϊα [Ἐνυά]λιον τὸν Διὸς ἐν Θράκῃ ποιῆσαι<sup>3)</sup> . . . ἕτεροι δὲ πρῶτους μὲν χαλκᾶ ὄπλα ἐνδύναί φασιν ποιήσαντας Κουρήτας ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ . . . ἄλλοι δ' Αἰγυπτίους λέγουσιν ὄπλα . . . ποιήσασθαι . . . [σιδηρ]ᾶ δὲ ὄπλα πρῶτος Ἑλλάνικος (4 F 189) κατασκευάσασθαι φησιν Σάνευνον Σκυθῶν ἄντα βασιλέα. Wilamowitz refers to Hesych. s.v. Τιτανίδα· τὴν Εὐβοίαν, παρόσον Βριάρεω θυγάτηρ ἦν and to Demetrios of Kal-latis (85 F 4) who calls Briareos a Cyclops. Grenfell-Hunt adduce for Euboia the great digression about the Kuretes in Strabo 10, 3, 19, where they are called Cretans by an anonymous author (περιθέσθαι δ' ὄπλα χαλκᾶ πρῶτους ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ, διὸ καὶ Καλκιδέας αὐτοὺς κληθῆναι) and Steph. Byz. s.v. Αἰθῆψος· Ἐπαφρόδιτος δὲ μαρτυρεῖ ἐκεῖ χαλκὸν πρῶτον εὐρεθῆναι, καὶ πρῶτοι χαλκὸν ἐκεῖ ἐνεδύσαντο οἱ Κούρητες. About the connexion of the Kuretes with the Cyclopes in Thrace and Euboia see also Roscher in *Rosch. Lex.* II col. 1688\* and Eitrem *RE* XI col. 2329. There were very many variants

because the material (iron, bronze) was also considered and a theory of the development was constructed. Euboeia plays a great part because of the resemblance of χαλκός to Χαλκίς; and the innovation of I. (if it is his) seems to have been the etymology of τεύχεα only: he invented a place called Teuchion in Euboeia, which is neither better nor worse than the connexion of the Χαλκιδεῖς with the χαλκᾶ δπλα. His notion may have reached the Chrestomathy through a somewhat detailed scholion on Homer the writer of which had perhaps consulted some collection of εὐρήματα. It is not very probable that I. himself developed his thesis in

10 the Ἀττικάι λέξεις.

(72) Aelian. *N. A.* 12, 5 (Clem. Al. *Protr.* 39, 6) Θηβαῖοι δὲ σέβουσιν . . . γαλῆν, καὶ λέγουσι γε Ἡρακλέους αὐτὴν γενέσθαι τροφόν, ἢ τροφὸν μὲν οὐδαμῶς, καθημένης δὲ ἐπ' ὠδίσι τῆς Ἀλκμήνης καὶ τεκεῖν οὐ δυναμένης τὴν δὲ παραδραμεῖν καὶ τοῦς τῶν ὠδίνων λῦσαι δεσμούς, καὶ προελθεῖν τὸν

15 Ἡρακλέα καὶ ἔρπειν ἦδη. Anton. Lib. *Met.* 29, following Nikander <sup>1)</sup>, narrates the event differently as to the details of how Προΐτου θυγάτηρ ἐν Θήβαις Γαλινθιάς, a playfellow of Alkmene (συμπαίκτηρια καὶ ἑταιρίς), deceives the 'Moirai and Eileithyia' <sup>2)</sup> and is changed into a ferret as a punishment. This version concludes with the Theban cult, described in some

20 detail: ταύτην Ἐκάτη . . . ὠικτεῖρε καὶ ἀπέδειξεν ἱερὰν αὐτῆς διάκονον· Ἡρακλῆς δ' ἐπεὶ ἠϋζήθη τὴν χάριν ἐμνημόνευσε, καὶ αὐτῆς ἐποίησεν ἀφίδρυμα παρὰ τὸν οἶκον, καὶ ἱερά προσήνεγκεν· ταῦτα νῦν ἔτι τὰ ἱερά Θηβαῖοι φυλάττουσι καὶ πρὸ Ἡρακλέους ἑορτῆς θύουσι Γαλινθιάδι πρώτῃ. Pausanias 9, 11, 3 narrates the σόφισμα similarly when describing the house of Amphitryon

25 in Thebes, giving different names and telling the story as the aition of a still existing monument; the women Hera sends are called Φαρμακίδες <sup>3)</sup> according to Theban tradition, and it is the daughter of Teiresias Historis who deceives them. It is obvious that these versions can not all be traced back to I. <sup>4)</sup>: he supplied one form of the story which developed the

30 simple account of the Iliad ('Αλκμήνης δ' ἀνέπαυσε τόκον, σχέθε δ' Εἰλειθυίας), and in doing so surely made use of a local tradition, rooted in faith and in cult. We cannot examine here who was the first to shape that story because we should have to present the entire tradition about the birth of Herakles; it also remains uncertain where I. mentioned it <sup>5)</sup>. But when

35 the scholiast cites I. <sup>6)</sup> besides the explanation of Aristarchos (Εἰλειθυίας· ὠδίνας, κατὰ μετωνυμίαν, ὡς Ἄρης ὁ σίδηρος, Ἡφαιστος τὸ πῦρ), this shows him to have rightly felt that the stylistic explanation does not give its due to the conception of the poet: succinct though the line is, the event is conceived as realistically as the birth of Apollo in *Hy. Hom. Apoll.* 89 ff.

(73) The words of Asteropaios Φ 152-160 presented the interpreters with two problems: (1) why was Asteropaios not mentioned in B 848-850? (2) why are the Paiones called *δολιχεγχείες* in Φ and *ἀγκυλοτόξοι* in B? The solution of the second problem, a reference to Teukros, was comparatively easy, even if not fully satisfactory. Another solution was therefore considered which, in view of the Catalogue, was even less satisfactory: Schol. BT *ἴσως οὖν διττὸν ἦν τὸ γένος, τὸ μὲν τοξεῦον, τὸ δὲ ἀκοντίζον (καὶ οἱ μὲν ὑπὸ Πυραίχμηι, οἱ δὲ ὑπ' Ἀστεροπαίωι Τ)· ἧ καὶ ἐπαμφοτερίζουσιν, ὡς καὶ Τεῦκρος*. For the omission in the Catalogue it was possible to refer to other names omitted there, and to explain that their bearers were subordinate commanders only. This was an even worse expedient, because the speech of Asteropaios in Φ actually fits the chief leader only. For this reason Euripides at the latest interpolated the line 848a, which occurs in none of our Mss. As I. referred to Θ 281 he must have discussed in some detail the person and the position of Teukros; and as he treated another son of Telamon in the *Σύμμικτα* (F 57) we must at least consider the possibility that all the quotations in the scholia on Homer belong to that book.

(74) Schol. Apoll. Rhod. *Arg.* 2, 357/9c (Et. M. p. 340, 19) *τὸν δὲ Πέλοπα Παφλαγὸνα τὸ γένος εἶπεν, ἄλλοι δὲ Λυδὸν αὐτὸν ἱστοροῦσιν· ὁ δὲ Εὐφορίων (F 135 Scheidw.) ἀμφοτέραις ταῖς δόξαις συντίθεται*. For the Paphlagonian origin see also *Arg.* 2, 789 ff.; Diodor. 4, 74, 1; on Deinias' Argolika 306 F 1. We do not know whether I. discussed the question; Schol. Pindar. *Ol.* 9, 15 = 298 F 1 b is not a sufficient foundation for claiming the variant of Lydian origin for him. If he did we do not know where; *Argolika, Eliaka, Hypomnemata* (perhaps on *Il.* B 104/5) are equally possible.

(75) As Themisto is called the daughter of Inachos in the same genealogy according to Rufin. *Recog.* 10, 21 Wilamowitz<sup>1)</sup> suggests the *Argolika*. The name<sup>2)</sup> must not be altered, for alongside of the Kallisto of Hesiod (F 181 Rz), who has been generally accepted, a Megisto, daughter of Keteus, appears in the Arcadian local historian Ariaitchos (316 F 2). *Bibl.* 3, 100 ff. does not supply a variant for the name, but it shows that the story of the mother of the eponym was narrated in rather different ways. Wilamowitz' transposition of the preceding sentence in Steph. Byz. (*καὶ τὸ ἄστρον λέγεται ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ τότε ἄρκτος κληθῆναι, ἧ ἄμαξα ἐλέγετο*) and his ascription of it to I. are doubtful.

(76) Oberhummer *RE* X col. 1964 no. 1; Buerchner *ibid.* col. 1994, 54 ff.

(77) Pausan. 9, 23, 2 Πίνδαρον δὲ ἡλικίαν ὄντα νεανίσκον καὶ ἰόντα ἐς



Θεσπιάς [θέρους] ὥραι καύματος περί μεσοῦσαν μάλιστα ἡμέραν κόπος καὶ ὕπνος ἀπ' αὐτοῦ κατελάμβανεν· ὁ μὲν δὴ ὡς εἶχε κατακλίνεται βραχὺ ὑπὲρ τῆς ὁδοῦ, μέλισσαι δὲ αὐτῷ καθεύδοντι προσεπέτοντό τε καὶ ἐπλασσον πρὸς τὰ χεῖλη τοῦ κηροῦ. Aelian. V. H. 12, 45 καὶ Πινδάρῳ τῆς πατρίδος οἰκίας  
5 ἐκτεθέντι μέλιτται τροφοὶ ἐγένοντο, ὑπὲρ τοῦ γάλακτος παρατιθεῖσαι μέλι.